

On the pancyclicity of digraphs with large semi-degrees

S. Kh. Darbinyan

Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems, Armenian National Academy of Sciences,

P. Sevak 1, Yerevan 0014, Armenia

Email: samdarbin @ ipia.sci.am

Abstract

Let D be an directed graph on $p \geq 10$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p - 1$ and minimum semi-degree at least $p/2 - 1$. We present a detailed proof of the following result [13]: The digraph D is pancyclic, unless some extremal cases (which are characterized).

Keywords: Digraphs; semi-degrees; cycles; Hamiltonian cycles; pancyclic digraphs.

Introduction and Notation

Ghouila-Houri [18] proved that every strong digraph on p vertices with minimum degree at least p is hamiltonian. There are many extentions of this theorem for digraphs and orgraphs. In particular, in many papers, various degree conditions have been obtained for digraphs (orgraphs) to be hamiltonian or pancyclic or vertex pancyclic (see e.g. [2]-[33]). C. Thomassen [31] proved that any digraph on $p = 2m + 1$ vertices with minimum semi-degree at least m is hamiltonian unless some extremal cases, which are characterized. In [9], we proved that if a digraph D satisfies the conditions of this Tomassen's theorem, then D also is pancyclic (the extremal cases are characterized). For additional information on hamiltonian and pancyclic digraphs see the book [1] by B. Jenssen and G. Gutin.

In this paper we present a detailed proof of the following result.

Every digraph D (unless some extremal cases) on $p \geq 10$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p - 1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2 - 1$ is pancyclic, unless some extremal cases (in [13], we gave only a short outline of the proof). In [12], we have proved that D contains cycles of length 3, 4, $p - 1$ and if $p = 2m$, then D also is hamiltonian.

In this paper we shall consider finite digraphs without loops and multiple arcs. For a digraph D , we denote by $V(D)$ the vertex set of D and by $A(D)$ the set of arcs in D . Sometimes we will write D instead of $A(D)$ and $V(D)$. If xy is an arc of D , then we say that x dominates y and y is dominated by x . For subsets A and $B \subset V(D)$ we define $A(A \rightarrow B)$ as the set $\{xy \in A(D)/x \in A, y \in B\}$ and $A(A, B) = A(A \rightarrow B) \cup A(B \rightarrow A)$. If $x \in V(D)$ and $A = \{x\}$ we write x instead of $\{x\}$. For disjoint subsets A and B of $V(D)$ $A \rightarrow B$ means that every vertex of A dominates every vertex of B . If $C \subset V(D)$, $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$, then we write $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$. The outset of vertex x is the set $O(x) = \{y \in V(D)/xy \in A(D)\}$ and $I(x) = \{y \in V(D)/yx \in A(D)\}$ is the inset of x . Similarly, if $A \subseteq V(D)$ then $O(x, A) = \{y \in A/xy \in A(D)\}$ and $I(x, A) = \{y \in A/yx \in A(D)\}$. The out-degree of x is $od(x) = |O(x)|$ and $id(x) = |I(x)|$ is the in-degree of x . Similarly, $od(x, A) = |O(x, A)|$ and $id(x, A) = |I(x, A)|$. The degree of the vertex x in D defined as $d(x) = id(x) + od(x)$. The subdigraph of D induced by a subset A of $V(D)$ is denoted by $\langle A \rangle$. The path (respectively, the cycle) consisting of the distinct vertices $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ ($n \geq 2$) and the arcs $x_i x_{i+1}$, $i \in [1, n - 1]$ (respectively, $x_i x_{i+1}$, $i \in [1, n - 1]$, and $x_n x_1$), is denoted $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ (respectively, $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n x_1$). The cycle on k vertices is denoted C_k . For a cycle $C_k = x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1$, the indices considered modulo k , i.e., $x_s = x_i$ for every s and i such that $i \equiv s \pmod k$, and we denote by $C_k[x_i, x_j] := x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_j$ ($C_k[x_i, x_j]$ is a path for $x_i \neq x_j$).

Two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if $xy \in A(D)$ or $yx \in A(D)$ (or both), i.e. x is adjacent with y and y is adjacent with x . Notation $A(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ (respectively, $A(x, y) = \emptyset$) denote that x and y are adjacent (respectively, are not adjacent).

For an undirected graph G , we denote by G^* symmetric digraph obtained from G by replacing every edge xy with the pair xy, yx of arcs. K_n (respectively, $K_{n,m}$) denotes the complete undirected graph on n vertices (respectively, undirected complete bipartite graph, with partite sets of cardinalities n and m), and $\overline{K}_n$ denotes the complement of K_n .

If G_1 and G_2 are undirected graphs, then $G_1 \cup G_2$ is the disjoint union of G_1 and G_2 . The join of G_1 and G_2 , denoted by $G_1 + G_2$, is the union of $G_1 \cup G_2$ and of all the edges between G_1 and G_2 .

For integers a and b , let $[a, b]$ denote the set of all integers which are not less than a and are not greater than b . If $I = [a, b]$ then we denote by $a := \text{left}\{I\}$ and $b := \text{right}\{I\}$.

We refer the reader to J.Bang-Jensens and G.Gutin's book [1] for notations and terminology not defined here.

Preliminary Results.

Lemma 1 ([21]). Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 3$ vertices containing a cycle C_n , $n \in [2, p-1]$ and let $x \notin C_n$. If $d(x, C_n) \geq n+1$, then D contains a cycle C_k for every $k \in [2, n+1]$. $\square$

The following Lemma will be used often in the proofs our results.

Lemma 2 ([6]). Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 3$ vertices containing a path $P := x_1x_2 \dots x_n$, $n \in [2, p-1]$. Let x be a vertex not contained in this path. If one of the following holds:

- (i) $d(x, P) \geq n+2$;
- (ii) $d(x, P) \geq n+1$ and $xx_1 \notin D$ or $x_nx_1 \notin D$;
- (iii) $d(x, P) \geq n$, $xx_1 \notin D$ and $x_nx \notin D$;

then there is an $i \in [1, n-1]$ such that $x_ix, xx_{i+1} \in D$, i. e., D contains a path $x_1x_2 \dots x_ixx_{i+1} \dots x_n$ of length n (we say that the vertex x can be inserted into P or the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_ixx_{i+1} \dots x_n$ is extended from P with x). $\square$

Note that the proof of Lemma 1 (see [21]) implies the following:

Lemma 3. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 4$ vertices containing a cycle $C_m = x_1x_2 \dots x_mx_1$, $m \in [2, p-1]$, and let x be a vertex not contained in this cycle. If $d(x, C_m) = m$ and for some $n \in [2, m+1]$ the digraph D contains no cycle of length n , then $xx_i \in D$ if and only if $x_{i+n-2}x \notin D$ for every $i \in [1, m]$. $\square$

Using Lemma 2 it is not difficult to prove the following:

Lemma 4. Let D be a digraph on p vertices containing a path $P := x_1x_2 \dots x_n$ and let x be a vertex not contained in this path.

a). Suppose that $xx_1 \notin D$, $x_nx \notin D$ and x cannot be inserted into P . Then the following hold:

(i) If $n \geq 4$, $x_1x, x_2x, x_nx \in D$ and $d(x, P) \geq n-1$, then there is an $l \in [1, n-3]$ such that $x_lx, xx_{l+3} \in D$.

(ii) If $n \geq 5$, $xx_n \in D$, $A(x \rightarrow \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}) = \emptyset$, $d(x, P) \geq n-2$ and $|A(x_i \rightarrow x)| + |A(x \rightarrow x_{i+3})| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [1, n-3]$, then there is an $l \in [1, n-4]$ such that $x_lx, xx_{l+4} \in D$.

b). If $n \geq 3$, $d(x, P) = n+1$ and x is adjacent with at most one vertex of two consecutive vertices of P , then n is odd and $O(x, P) = I(x, P) = \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_n\}$. $\square$

Notation. Let $C_n = x_1x_2 \dots x_nx_1$ be a cycle. For any pair of integers $i, j \in [1, n]$: if $i \leq j$ we denote by $C(i, j) := \{x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j\}$, and if $i > j$ let $C(i, j) := \emptyset$. Let $f(i, j) := |C(i, j)|$.

Lemma 5. Let D be a strongly connected digraph on $p \geq 10$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2-1$. Let $C := C_{p-1} := x_1x_2 \dots x_{p-1}x_1$ be an arbitrary cycle of length $p-1$ in D and let x be the vertex not contained in this cycle. Suppose that x is adjacent with all vertices of cycle C . Then D contains a cycle C_n for all $n \in [3, p-2]$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that for some $n \in [3, p-2]$ the digraph D contains no cycle C_n . It is easy to see that $n \geq 5$. Applying Lemmas 1 and 3 we find that $d(x) = p-1$ and for all $i \in [1, p-1]$,

$$|A(x, x_i)| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad xx_i \in D \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x_{i+n-2}x \notin D. \quad (*)$$

Notation. We denote by $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k, N_1, N_2, \dots, N_k$ the maximal subpaths (sets) on cycle C for which both of the following hold (we take the indices of M_i and N_i modulo k):

- (i) Every vertex of M_i (respectively, N_i) is dominated by x (respectively, dominates x);
- (ii) The subpaths M_i and N_i are labeled in such way that on the cycle C the subpath M_i preceding of N_i and N_i preceding of M_{i+1} .

Let $m_i := |M_i|$ and $n_i := |N_i|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$m_1 = \max\{m_i/1 \leq i \leq k\} \geq \max\{n_i/1 \leq i \leq k\} \quad (1)$$

(for otherwise we consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$). Let $I_1 := [3, m_1 + n_1 + 1]$ and for all $l \in [2, k]$ let

$$I_l = \left[\sum_{i=2}^l m_i + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} n_i + 3, \sum_{i=1}^l (m_i + n_i) + 1 \right].$$

From the definitions of the sets M_i, N_i and from $(*)$ it is easy to see that $k \geq 2$ and $n \notin \cup_{i=1}^k I_i$. From (1) it follows that for each $j \in [2, k]$,

$$\text{right}\{I_{j-1}\} + 1 \geq \text{left}\{I_j\} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{right}\{I_j\} > \text{right}\{I_{j-1}\}.$$

Hence, since $n \notin \cup_{i=1}^k I_i$, for some $s \in [2, k]$ we have $\text{right}\{I_{s-1}\} + 1 \leq n \leq \text{left}\{I_s\} - 1$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (m_i + n_i) + 2 \leq n \leq \sum_{i=2}^s m_i + \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} n_i + 2.$$

This implies that $m_1 \leq m_s$. Hence by (1) we have

$$m_1 = m_s \quad \text{and} \quad n = \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (m_i + n_i) + 2.$$

From $(*)$ it follows that for all $l \in [1, k]$,

$$m_l = m_{l+s-1}, \quad n_l = n_{l+s-1} \quad \text{and} \quad n = \sum_{i=l}^{l+s-2} (m_i + n_i) + 2. \quad (2)$$

For any $t \in [2, k+1]$ denote by $q_t := \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (m_i + n_i)$, in particular, $q_s = n-2$, $q_{k+1} = p-1$. Note that

$$xx_{q_t+1} \in D, \quad xx_{q_t} \notin D \quad \text{and} \quad x_{q_t+n-2}x \in D \quad \text{by } (*). \quad (3)$$

To be definite, assume that $M_1 := \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m_1}\}$. We first prove the following Claims 1-5.

Claim 1. If $j \in [s+1, k+1]$, then

- (i) $x_{n-1}x_{q_j+1} \notin D$, in particular, $x_{n-1}x_1 \notin D$;
- (ii) $|A(x_{q_j+1} \rightarrow x_{n-1})| + |A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow x_{q_j+2})| \leq 1$, in particular, $d(x_{n-1}, \{x_{q_j+1}, x_{q_j+2}\}) \leq 2$.

Proof. Assume that Claim 1 is not true. Then

- (i) $x_{n-1}x_{q_j+1} \in D$ and $C_n = x_{n-1}x_{q_j+1}x_{q_j+2} \dots x_{q_j+n-2}x_{n-1}$ by (3);
- (ii) $x_{q_j+1}x_{n-1}, x_{n-1}x_{q_j+2} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{q_j+1}x_{n-1}x_{q_j+2} \dots x_{q_j+n-2}x$ by (3). In both cases we have a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 2. If $m_1 \geq 2$, then $L_1 := A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow \cup_{j=s}^k N_j) = \emptyset$.

Proof. In the converse case, if $x_{n-1}z \in L_1$, then $C_n = xx_2x_3 \dots x_{n-1}zx$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 3. If $m_1 \geq 2$ and $j \in [s, k]$, then $L_2(j) := A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow (M_j - \{x_{q_j+1}, x_{q_j+2}\})) = \emptyset$.

Proof. In the converse case, if $x_{n-1}x_i \in L_2(j)$, then from the maximality of m_1 it follows that $d-1 := |\{x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{q_j+m_j+1}\}| \leq m_1 - 1$ and $C_n = xx_dx_{d+1} \dots x_{n-1}x_ix_{i+1} \dots x_{q_j+m_j+1}x$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 4. $x_{n-1}x_{p-1} \notin D$.

Proof. In the converse case, $x_{n-1}x_{p-1} \in D$ and $C_n = x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}x_{p-1}x_1$, a contradiction. $\square$

From the maximality of m_1 and Claims 2 and 4 it follows that

$$d(x_{n-1}, N_k) \leq n_k. \quad (4)$$

Using Claims 1-3, we get

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(n, p - n_k - 1)) \leq p - n - n_k + 1. \quad (5)$$

Since the vertex x_{n-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-2}$ and $x_{n-1}x_1 \notin D$ (Claim 1), using Lemma 2(ii), we get

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) \leq n-2. \quad (6)$$

Hence, by (4) and (5), we conclude that

$$n_k \geq d(x_{n-1}, N_k) \geq n_k - 1, \quad (7)$$

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) \begin{cases} = n-2, & \text{if } d(x_{n-1}, N_k) = n_k - 1, \\ \geq n-3, & \text{if } d(x_{n-1}, N_k) = n_k. \end{cases}$$

Claim 5. If $t \in [2, n-2]$, then $|A(x_{t-3} \rightarrow x_{n-1})| + |A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow x_t)| \leq 1$.

Proof. Assume that the claim is false, that is $t \in [2, n-2]$ and $x_{t-3}x_{n-1}, x_{n-1}x_t \in D$. Let the integer t with these properties be the smallest. If $t \leq n - n_{s-1} - 1$, then $C_n = xx_{q_k+m_k} \dots x_{t-3}x_{n-1}x_t \dots x_{n-n_{s-1}-1}x$ since $n_k = n_{s-1}$ by (2), a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $t \geq n - n_{s-1}$ (in particular, $x_t \in N_{s-1}$). Hence from $t \leq n-2$ it follows that $n_{s-1} \geq 2$. Therefore $m_1 \geq 2$ by (1), and $t \geq 4$. It is not difficult to see that for all $i \in [1, n-3]$,

$$\text{if } d := |\{x_{i+1}, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_{n-2}\}| \leq m_1, \quad \text{then } x_ix_{n-1} \notin D \quad (8)$$

(otherwise $x_ix_{n-1} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{m_1-d+1}x_{m_1-d+2} \dots x_ix_{n-1} \dots x_{q_s+m_s+1}x$ since $m_1 = m_s$). Together with $t \geq n - n_{s-1}$, $m_1 \geq n_{s-1}$ and the fact that x_{n-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-2}$ this implies that $t = n - n_{s-1}$, $m_1 = n_{s-1}$ and

$$A(\{x_{t-2}, x_{t-1}\} \rightarrow x_{n-1}) = A(x_{n-1}, x_{t-2}) = \emptyset. \quad (9)$$

Note that $n_k = n_{s-1} \geq 2$ by (2). From this it follows that if $i \in [3, t]$, then

$$|A(x_{i-4} \rightarrow x_{n-1})| + |A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow x_i)| \leq 1, \quad (10)$$

(otherwise $C_n = xx_{q_k+m_k} \dots x_{i-4}x_{n-1}x_i \dots x_t x$). From (10), in particular, we have $x_{t-4}x_{n-1} \notin D$.

Suppose first that $A(x_{n-1}, x_{t-1}) = \emptyset$. Then, since $x_{n-1}x_1 \notin D$ and the vertex x_{n-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-2}$, using Lemma 2 and (9), we obtain $d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) \leq n-3$. From this, (7) and Claim 2, we get $N_k \rightarrow x_{n-1}$ and $d(x_{n-1}, C(1, t-3)) = t-3$. Since $x_{t-4}x_{n-1} \notin D$ by (10), we obtain that $t \geq 5$, and by Lemma 2 there is an $i \in [2, t-3]$ such that $x_{n-1}x_i$ and $x_{i-3}x_{n-1} \in D$, which contradicts the minimality of t .

Suppose next that $A(x_{n-1}, x_{t-1}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $x_{t-1}x_{n-1} \notin D$ and $x_{n-1}x_{t-1} \in D$ by (9). From (8) we have $d(x_{n-1}, C(t, n-2)) \leq n-t$. Then it follows from (7) that

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(1, t-1)) \geq \begin{cases} t-3, & \text{if } d(x_{n-1}, N_k) = n_k, \\ t-2, & \text{if } d(x_{n-1}, N_k) = n_k - 1. \end{cases}$$

In both cases it is easy to see that

$$d(x_{n-1}, \{x_{p-2}, x_{p-1}, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{t-1}\}) \geq t-1.$$

Since $A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow \{x_{p-2}, x_{p-1}, x_1\}) = \emptyset$, $x_{n-1}x_{t-1} \in D$ and $x_{t-1}x_{n-1} \notin D$, by Lemma 4(ii) there is an $j \in [2, t-1]$ such that $x_{j-3}x_{n-1}$, $x_{n-1}x_j \in D$ or $x_{j-4}x_{n-1}$, $x_{n-1}x_j \in D$ ($j \geq 3$), which contradicts the minimality of t or inequality (10). This completes the proof of Claim 5. $\square$

Claim 6. If $x_{n-1}x_2 \in D$, then $L_3 := A(\cup_{j=s}^k M_j \setminus \{x_{n-1}\} \rightarrow x_{n-1}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Otherwise $x_{n-1}x_2 \in D$, $zx_{n-1} \in L_3$ and $C_n = zx_{n-1}x_2x_3 \dots x_{n-2}x$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 7. The vertex x_{n-1} dominates at most $(p-n-1)/2$ vertices from $C(n, p-1)$.

Proof. Let $m_1 = 1$. Then by (1), $m_i = n_i = 1$ for all $i \in [1, k]$ and $n \leq p-3$. Observe that $p-3$ and n are even. Using Claims 1(i) and 4, we obtain

$$O(x_{n-1}, C(n, p-1)) \subseteq \{x_n, x_{n+2}, x_{n+4}, \dots, x_{p-3}\}.$$

Hence the claim is true for $m_1 = 1$ since

$$|\{x_n, x_{n+2}, x_{n+4}, \dots, x_{p-3}\}| = (p-n-1)/2.$$

Let now $m_1 \geq 2$. Then $m_1 = m_s \geq 2$ by (2). If $n = p-2$, then $s = k$, $m_k = 2$ and $n_k = 1$. Together with (2) and (*) this implies that $m_i = 2$ and $n_i = 1$ for all $i \in [1, k]$. Therefore $id(x) \leq p/2 - 2$, a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $n \leq p-3$. According to Claims 1-4 we have

$$\text{if } m_s \geq 3, \quad \text{then } od(x_{n-1}, C(n, p-1)) \leq (m_s - 1 + m_{s+1} + \dots + m_k)/2 \leq (p-n-1)/2;$$

$$\text{if } m_s = 2, \quad \text{then } od(x_{n-1}, C(n, p-1)) \leq 1 + (m_{s+1} + m_{s+2} + \dots + m_k)/2 \leq (p-n-1)/2$$

since $n \leq p-3$. Claim 7 is proved. $\square$

Now we shall complete the proof of Lemma 5.

From Claim 7, $od(x_{n-1}) \geq (p-2)/2$ and the fact that $A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow \{x, x_1\}) = \emptyset$ it follows that there is an $l \in [2, n-3]$ such that $x_{n-1} \rightarrow \{x_l, x_{l+1}\}$. Choose l with these properties is as small as possible.

Note that x_{n-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-2}$. Now using the minimality property of l , Lemma 2 and Claim 5, we see that

$$A(x_{n-1}, x_{l-1}) = A(\{x_{l-3}, x_{l-2}\} \rightarrow x_{n-1}) = \emptyset. \quad (11)$$

First we prove that $l \geq 3$. Assume that $l = 2$. Then $A(x_{n-1}, x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$ by (11) and Claim 4. Hence it is easy to see that

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(n, p-1)) \leq p - n - 1. \quad (12)$$

Indeed, if $m_1 \geq 2$, then (12) immediately follows from Claims 2 and 6 and if $m_1 = 1$, then $M_j = \{x_{q_j+1}\}$ and (12) follows from Claims 1(i) and 6. By (12),

$$p - 1 \leq d(x_{n-1}) = d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) + d(x_{n-1}, C(n, p-1)) + 1 \leq d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) + p - n.$$

Hence $d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) \geq n - 1$, which contradicts (6). This proves that $l \geq 3$.

Suppose first that $A(x_{l-2}, x_{n-1}) = \emptyset$. If $l = 3$, then

$$A(x_{n-1}, \{x_{p-1}, x_1, x_2\}) = \emptyset, \quad d(x_{n-1}, N_k) \leq n_k - 1$$

(by (11) and Claims 2, 4) and

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) = d(x_{n-1}, C(3, n-2)) \leq n - 3 \quad (\text{by Lemma 2}),$$

which contradicts (7). Thus we may assume that $l \geq 4$. Since $A(x_{n-1}, \{x_{l-1}, x_{l-2}\}) = \emptyset$, using Lemma 2 and (11), we obtain

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) = d(x_{n-1}, C(1, l-3)) + d(x_{n-1}, C(l, n-2)) \leq n - 4,$$

which also contradicts (7).

Suppose next that $A(x_{l-2}, x_{n-1}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $x_{n-1}x_{l-2} \in D$ by (11). Since $A(x_{n-1} \rightarrow \{x_{p-1}, x_1\}) = \emptyset$ it follows that $l \geq 4$. Therefore, since $A(x_{l-1}, x_{n-1}) = \emptyset$ by (11), from (7) and Lemma 2 it follows that

$$d(x_{n-1}, C(1, n-2)) = n - 3 \quad (13)$$

and $d(x_{n-1}, N_k) = n_k$. From this and Claims 2, 4 it is easy to see that $N_k \rightarrow x_{n-1}$. If $n_k \geq 2$ or $x_1x_{n-1} \in D$, then, since $d(x_{n-1}, N_k \cup C(1, l-2)) \geq n_k + l - 3$, by Lemma 4(i) there is an $i \in [2, l-2]$ such that $x_{i-3}x_{n-1}, x_{n-1}x_i \in D$, which contradicts Claim 5. So, we may assume that $n_k = 1$ and $A(x_1, x_{n-1}) = \emptyset$. Because of this and (13), by Lemma 2 we have $x_{n-1}x_2 \in D$. Therefore Claim 6 holds (i.e., $L_3 = \emptyset$). Now using Claims 1 and 2, we see that $d(x_{n-1}, C(n, p-1)) \leq p - n$. Together with (13) this implies that $d(x_{n-1}) \leq p - 2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 5. $\square$

Notation. In the following, for any integer k , $\bar{k}$ denotes the element of $[1, p-1]$ ($p \geq 3$) which is congruent to k modulo $p-1$ (i.e., $\bar{k} \equiv k \pmod{p-1}$).

Lemma 6. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 10$ vertices with minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2 - 1$. Let D contains a cycle $C := C_{p-1} := x_1x_2 \dots x_{p-1}x_1$ of length $p-1$ and let for some $n \in [5, p-2]$ the digraph D contains no cycle of length n . Suppose that the vertex $x \notin V(C)$ is adjacent with the vertex x_1 , is not adjacent with the vertex x_{p-1} and there are positive integers k and a with $k + a \leq p - 2$ such that $xx_a, x_{p-k-1}x \in D$ and

$$A(C(p-k, p-1) \rightarrow x) = A(x \rightarrow C(1, a-1)) = \emptyset. \quad (a \geq 2) \quad (14)$$

Then the following statements hold:

- (i) $n \leq p - k - a + 2$;
- (ii) If $i \in [p - k - 1, p - 2]$, $j \in [1, a]$ and $f(j, i) \geq n - 1$, then $x_i x_j \notin D$;
- (iii) If $p - k - 2 \leq i < j \leq p - 1$, then $x_i x_j \in D$ if and only if $j = i + 1$ (i.e., $f(i, j) = 2$).

Proof. Since $C_n \not\subset D$, it follows from Lemmas 1 and 3 that $d(x) = p - 1$, $id(x), od(x) \leq m$, where $m := \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$, and for each $i \in [1, p - 1]$,

$$|A(x \rightarrow x_i)| + |A(x_{i+n-2} \rightarrow x)| = 1, \quad \text{in particular, } x_{a+n-3}x \in D. \quad (*)$$

Proof of statements (i) and (ii) immediately follows from $d(x) = p - 1$, (14), (*) and Lemma 1.

Proof of (iii). Suppose that statement (iii) is false. Then there are integers s and t with $p - k - 2 \leq s < t - 1 \leq p - 2$ such that $x_s x_t \in D$. Choose the vertices x_s and x_t so that $f(s, t)$ is as small as possible. Let $d := f(s + 1, t - 1)$. Note that

$$3 \leq d + 2 = f(s, t) \leq k + 2. \quad (15)$$

From $A(C(p - k, p - 1) \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$ by (14) and (*) it follows that

$$x \rightarrow C(p - k - n + 2, p - n + 1), \quad \text{in particular, } x x_{p-k-n+2} \in D. \quad (16)$$

Note that $p - k - n + 2 \geq a$ by Lemma 6(i). Together with (16) and $A(x, x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$ this implies that there is a vertex x_q , $q \in [p - n + 1, p - 2]$, such that

$$x x_{q+1} \notin D \quad \text{and} \quad x \rightarrow C(p - k - n + 2, q). \quad (17)$$

Remark that from $x x_{q+1} \notin D$ and (*) we have $x_{q+n-1}x \in D$.

Case 1. $q \leq p - k - 2$.

If $f(\overline{q+n}, q) \geq d$, then by (15), (17) and $x_{q+n-1}x \in D$ we have $x x_{q-d+1} \in D$ and $C_n = x x_{q-d+1} x_{q-d+2} \dots x_s x_t \dots x_{q+n-1} x$, a contradiction. Therefore, we may assume that $f(\overline{q+n}, q) < d$. From this, (15), Lemma 6(i) and $f(\overline{q+n}, q) + n = p$ it is easy to see that

$$p - k + 1 \leq n = p - f(\overline{q+n}, q) \leq p - k - a + 2.$$

This implies that $a = 1$, $f(\overline{q+n}, q) = k - 1$, $n = p - k + 1$ and $d = k$. Therefore, $x x_1 \in D$, $s = p - k - 2$ and $t = p - 1$ (i.e., $x_{p-k-2} x_{p-1} \in D$). From $5 \leq n \leq p - 2$ and $n = p - k + 1$ it follows that $p - k \geq 4$ and $k \geq 3$. Hence by the minimality of $f(s, t)$ we have

$$A(C(p - k - 1, p - 3) \rightarrow x_{p-1}) = A(C(p - k - 2, p - 4) \rightarrow x_{p-2}) = \emptyset. \quad (18)$$

Since $n = p - k + 1$, using $A(C(p - k, p - 1) \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$ by (14) and (*) we see that

$$x \rightarrow C(1, k) \quad (19)$$

We have a cycle $C_{n-1} := x x_1 x_2 \dots x_{p-k-1} x$ of length $n - 1$ and x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into this cycle C_{n-1} . Hence, since $x_{p-k-2} x_{p-1} \in D$, we have $x_{p-1} x_{p-k-1} \notin D$. Therefore, $A(x_{p-1}, x_{p-k-1}) = \emptyset$ by (18), and $d(x_{p-1}, C(1, p - k - 1)) \leq p - k - 1$ by Lemma 2(ii). These together with (18) and $d(x_{p-1}) \geq p - 1$ give

$$x_{p-1} \rightarrow C(p - k, p - 2). \quad (20)$$

If $x_i x_{p-k-1} \in D$, where $i \in [p-k, p-2]$, then $C_n = x x_2 x_3 \dots x_{p-k-2} x_{p-1} x_i x_{p-k-1} x$ by (19) and (20), a contradiction. So we may assume that

$$A(C(p-k, p-1) \rightarrow x_{p-k-1}) = \emptyset. \quad (21)$$

Therefore

$$id(x_{p-k-1}, C(1, p-k-3)) \geq p/2 - 3. \quad (22)$$

It is easy to see that if $i \in [1, p-k-3]$, then

$$|A(x_i \rightarrow x_{p-k-1})| + |A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow x_{i+1})| \leq 1,$$

for otherwise $x_i x_{p-k-1}, x_{p-k} x_{i+1} \in D$ and $C_n = x_{p-1} x_1 x_2 \dots x_i x_{p-k-1} x_{p-k} x_{i+1} \dots x_{p-k-2} x_{p-1}$, a contradiction. From this and (22) it follows that x_{p-k} does not dominate at least $p/2 - 3$ vertices from $C(2, p-k-2)$. From the minimality of $f(s, t)$ we also have that x_{p-k} does not dominate $k-2$ vertices from $C(p-k+1, p-1)$. On the other hand, from (14), (21) and Lemma 6(ii) we get that $A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow \{x, x_{p-k-1}, x_1\}) = \emptyset$. Hence, by our arguments above we have that x_{p-k} does not dominate at least $p/2 + k - 2$ vertices. This implies that $od(x_{p-k}) \leq p/2 - k + 1 \leq p/2 - 2$ since $k \geq 3$, a contradiction. The discussion of Case 1 is completed.

Case 2. $q \geq p - k - 1$.

From $x x_{q+1} \notin D$ and (14) it follows that $A(x, x_{q+1}) = \emptyset$. Since $\delta^0(x) \geq p/2 - 1$ and $d(x) = p - 1$ we see that $od(x) \leq p/2$. Hence from $q \geq p - k - 1$ and (17) we have $n - 2 \leq p/2$ (i.e., $n \leq p/2 + 2$).

For Case 2 we first prove the following Claims 1-5.

Claim 1. $L_4 := A(x_q \rightarrow C(q+2, p-1) \cup C(1, a-1)) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Assume that $x_q x_i \in L_4$ for some $i \in [q+2, p-1] \cup [1, a-1]$. Recall that $n \leq p - k - a + 2$ by Lemma 6(i). Hence the cycle $C' := x_a x_{a+1} \dots x_q x_i \dots x_a$ has length at least $n - 1$. Then, since $d(x) = p - 1$, (14) and $A(x_{q+1}, x) = \emptyset$, we obtain $d(x, V(C')) \geq |V(C')| + 1$. Therefore $C_n \subset D$ by Lemma 1, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 2. If $p - k - n \geq a + n - 4$, then $A(x_q \rightarrow C(a, a + n - 3)) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that there is an $i \in [0, n - 3]$ such that $x_q x_{a+i} \in D$. Then, since $x_{a+n-3} x \in D$ by (*), $f(p - k - n + 2, q) \geq n - 2$ and (17), we have $C_n = x_q x_{a+i} x_{a+i+1} \dots x_{a+n-3} x x_{q-i} x_{q-i+1} \dots x_q$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 3. If $a < p - k - n + 1 \leq a + n - 4$, then $A(x_q \rightarrow C(a, p - k - n + 1)) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Assume that the claim is not true, that there is an $i \in [0, p - k - n - a + 1]$ such that $x_q x_{a+i} \in D$. Note that $a + n - 3 \leq p - k - 3$. From $q \geq p - k - 1$ and $i \in [0, p - k - n - a + 1]$ it follows that $q - i \geq n + a - 2$. Therefore $x x_{q-i} \in D$ by (17), and $C_n = x_q x_{a+i} x_{a+i+1} \dots x_{a+n-3} x x_{q-i} x_{q-i+1} \dots x_q$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 4. If $q \geq p - k$, then the following hold:

- (i) $f(p - k, q) \leq n - 3$;
- (ii) $A(x_q \rightarrow C(p - k - n + 2, p - k - n + 2 + f(p - k, q - 1))) = \emptyset$.

Proof. (i) Suppose, on the contrary, that $f(p - k, q) \geq n - 2$. From this, since $p - k + f(p - k, q) = q + 1$, we have $q - n + 3 \geq p - k$. Note that $I(x) \subseteq C(1, p - k - 1)$ by (14). It is easy to see that if $x_i \in I(x)$, then $x_q x_i \notin D$ (otherwise $x_i x, x_q x_i \in D$ and $C_n = x_q x_i x x_{q-n+3} x_{q-n+4} \dots x_q$ by $x x_{q-n+3} \in D$). Therefore from $id(x)$, $od(x_q) \geq p/2 - 1$ and $x_q x \notin D$ it follows that $x_q x_j \in D$ if and only if $x_j \notin I(x)$. Then,

since $x_{p-1}x \notin D$ we have $x_qx_{p-1} \in D$, and $q = p - 2$ by Claim 1. If $x_qx_1 \in D$ ($x_q = x_{p-2}$), then $C' := x_1x_2 \dots x_{p-2}x_1$ is a cycle of the length $p - 2$ with $d(x, C') = p - 1$, and hence D contains a cycle C_n by Lemma 1, a contradiction. So, we may assume that $x_qx_1 \notin D$ and $x_1x \in D$. Then, since $q - n + 4 \geq p - k + 1$, $C_n = xx_{q-n+4} \dots x_qx_{q+1}x_1x$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of inequality $f(p - k, q) \leq n - 3$.

(ii) Suppose, on the contrary, that there is an $i \in [1, f(p - k, q)]$ such that $x_qx_{p-k-n+1+i} \in D$. Then $p - k - n + 1 + i \leq p - k - n + 1 + n - 3 = p - k - 2$ by Claim 4(i), and $C_n = x_qx_{p-k-n+1+i} \dots x_{p-k-1}xx_{q-i+1} \dots x_q$, a contradiction. Claim 4 is proved. $\square$

Claim 5. If $a + n \geq p - k - n + 4$, then $n \geq \begin{cases} p/2 + 1, & \text{if } q \geq p - k, \\ p/2, & \text{if } q = p - k - 1. \end{cases}$

Proof. Put $B := C(p - k - n + 2 + f(p - k, q), q + 1) \setminus \{x_q\}$. From Claims 1-4 it follows that

$$O(x_q) \subseteq \begin{cases} B, & \text{if } q \geq p - k, \\ B \cup \{x\}, & \text{if } q = p - k - 1. \end{cases}$$

Then $p/2 - 1 \leq od(x_q) \leq \begin{cases} n - 2, & \text{if } q \geq p - k, \\ n - 1, & \text{if } q = p - k - 1 \end{cases}$ since $|B| = n - 2$. Claim 5 is proved. $\square$

We now consider the following two subcases.

Subcase 2.1. $a + n \geq p - k - n + 4$.

Using (*) and (17), we obtain

$$x_{q+n-1}x \in D \quad \text{and} \quad A(\{x_{q+1}, x_{q+2}, \dots, x_{q+n-2}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset. \quad (23)$$

Claim 5 and $n \leq p/2 + 2$ imply that $m \leq n \leq m + 2$ ($m := \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$).

Suppose that $n = m + 2$. From $q \geq p - k - 1$, (17) and $od(x) \leq m$ it follows that $q = p - k - 1$ and

$$A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q+1}, x_{q+2}, \dots, x_{p-k-n+1}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Together with $\overline{q + n - 2} \geq p - k - n + 1$ and (23) this implies that

$$A(x, \{x_{q+1}, x_{q+2}, \dots, x_{p-k-n+1}\}) = \emptyset. \quad (24)$$

Hence $x_1 = x_{p-k-n+2}$ (i.e., $n = p - k + 1$ and $x_{p-1} = x_{p-k-n+1}$) and $k \geq m - 1 \geq 4$. From $k \geq 4$ and (*) we get $x_{p-k-2}x \in D$. By (24) and Lemma 1, we can assume that $s = p - k - 2$ and

$$A(C(p - k - 1, p - 3) \rightarrow x_{p-1}) = \emptyset, \quad (25)$$

in particular, $x_{p-k-1}x_{p-1} \notin D$. Then, since $d(x_{p-1}) \geq p - 1$ and the vertex x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_1x_2 \dots x_{p-k-1}$, using Lemma 2(ii) and (25) we get that $x_{p-1}x_{p-k} \in D$. From this it is easy to see that if $x_{p-k}x_i \in D$, $i \in [2, p - k - 1]$, then $x_{i-1}x_{p-1} \notin D$ (otherwise, if $i \geq 3$, then $C_n = xx_2 \dots x_{i-1}x_{p-1}x_{p-k}x_ix_{i+1} \dots x_{p-k-1}x$ and if $i = 2$, then $C_n = xx_1x_{p-1}x_{p-k}x_2 \dots x_{p-k-2}x$). Again using Lemma 1 and (24), we obtain

$$A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow C(p - k + 2, p - 1) \cup \{x_1\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore x_{p-k} dominates at least $p/2 - 2$ vertices of $C(2, p - k - 1)$. This implies that x_{p-1} is not dominated at least by $p/2 - 2$ vertices from $C(1, p - k - 2)$. Together with (25), $k \geq 4$ and $xx_{p-1} \notin D$ this implies that $id(x_{p-1}) \leq p/2 - 2$, a contradiction.

Now suppose that $m \leq n \leq m+1$ and $q = p-k-1$. From Claim 5 and $n \leq m+1$ we obtain that

$$p-k-n-1 \leq \overline{p-k+n-2} \leq p-k-n+1. \quad (26)$$

From $q = p-k-1$, (17) and (*) it follows that

$$A(\{x_{p-k}, x_{p-k+1}, \dots, x_{p-k+n-3}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset,$$

and $x_{p-k+n-2}x \in D$ (i.e., $k \leq n-2$). This implies that $d := f(s+1, t-1) \leq n-2$. If $t \geq p-k+1$, then $C_n = xx_{p-k-d} \dots x_{p-k-d+1} \dots x_s x_t x_{t+1} \dots x_{p-k+n-2}x$, a contradiction. Therefore $t = p-k$ and $s = p-k-2$. From our supposition that $C_n \not\subset D$ it is not difficult to see that

$$A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow \{x_{p-k-1}, x_{p-k-n}, x_{p-k-n+1}\}) = \emptyset. \quad (27)$$

If $x_{p-k}x_{p-k+i} \in D$, where $i \in [2, n-2]$, then $C_n = x_{p-k}x_{p-k+i}x_{p-k+i+1} \dots x_{p-k+n-2}xx_{p-k-i+1} \dots x_{p-k}$ by (17), a contradiction. So we may assume that

$$A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow \{x_{p-k+2}, x_{p-k+3}, \dots, x_{p-k+n-2}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Together with (26) and (27) this implies that

$$O(x_{p-k}) \subseteq C(p-k-n+2, p-k-2) \cup \{x_{p-k+1}\}.$$

Therefore $n-2 \geq p/2-1$. Then, since $n \leq m+1$, it follows that $p = 2m$, $n = m+1$, $x_{p-k}x_{p-k-n+2} \in D$ and $x_{p-k-n+1} = x_{p-k+n-2}$. Hence, by (23) it is obvious that there is a vertex $x_j \in C(p-k-n+2, p-k-2)$ such that $x_jx \in D$. But then by (17), $C_n = x_{p-k}x_{p-k-n+2} \dots x_jxx_{j+1} \dots x_{p-k}$, a contradiction.

Finally suppose that $m \leq n \leq m+1$ and $q \geq p-k$. Then $p = 2m$ and $n = m+1$ by Claim 5. Using $od(x) \leq m$ and (17), we get that $q = p-k$, $x_a = x_{p-k-n+2} = x_{p-k+n-1}$ and

$$A(x, \{x_{p-k+1}, x_{p-k+2}, \dots, x_{p-k+n-2}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore $a = 1$ and $x_1x \in D$. Now using (14) with Lemma 1, we obtain

$$A(C(p-k-1, p-3) \rightarrow x_{p-1}) = A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow C(p-k+2, p-1) \cup \{x_1\}) = \emptyset.$$

Together with $f(p-k-1, p-3) = m-1$ and $xx_{p-1} \notin D$, $x_{p-k}x \notin D$ (by (14)) this implies that $x_{p-k-2}x_{p-1}, x_{p-k}x_2 \in D$ and $C_n = x_{p-k}x_2 \dots x_{p-k-2}x_{p-1}x_1xx_{p-k}$, which is a contradiction and completes the discussion of Subcase 2.1.

Subcase 2.2. $a+n-3 \leq p-k-n$.

Put $\alpha := |I(x) \cap C(p-k-n+2, p-k-1)|$, $\beta := |I(x) \cap C(a, a+n-3)|$,
 $\gamma := |I(x) \cap C(a+n-2, p-k-n+1)|$ and

$$B_1 := C(q+2, p-1) \cup C(1, a+n-3) \cup C(p-k-n+2, p-k-n+1+f(p-k, q)).$$

It is clear that

$$1 \leq \alpha \leq n-2, \quad 1 \leq \beta \leq n-2 \quad \text{and} \quad |B_1| = a+n+k-4. \quad (28)$$

From Claims 1, 2 and 4(ii) it follows that

$$A(x_q \rightarrow B_1) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad |B_1| \leq m. \quad (29)$$

For Subcase 2.2 first we will prove Claims 6-9.

Claim 6. $\beta \leq k$.

Proof. If $n - 2 \leq k$, then $\beta \leq n - 2 \leq k$ by (28). So we may assume that $n - 3 \geq k$. Then from $q \geq p - k - 1$ and (*) it follows that $x_1x \notin D$. This means that $a = 1$ and $a + n - 3 = n - 2$. Then, since

$$x \rightarrow C(p - k - n + 2, q) \quad \text{and} \quad |C(p - k - n + 2, q)| \geq k + 1,$$

from (*) it follows that $A(C(1, n - k - 2) \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$. Hence $\beta \leq |C(1, n - 2) \setminus C(1, n - k - 2)| \leq k$. Claim 6 is proved. $\square$

Note that from $id(x) \geq m - 1$, $\beta \leq k$ and (14) it follows that

$$\gamma \geq id(x) - (\alpha + \beta + a - 1) \geq id(x) - (\alpha + a + k - 1) \geq m - \alpha - a - k. \quad (30)$$

Claim 7. If $q = p - k - 1$, then $s = p - k - 2$, $t = p - k$ and $A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow B_1 \setminus \{x_{p-k+1}\}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Since $q = p - k - 1$, from the definitions of B_1 and q it follows that $B_1 = C(p - k + 1, p - 1) \cup C(1, a + n - 3)$ and $xx_{p-k} \notin D$. Therefore $x_{p-k+n-2}x \in D$ by (*). Together with (14) this implies that $\overline{p - k + n - 2} = n - k - 1 \geq 1$ (i.e., $n \geq k + 2$ and $x_{p-k+n-2} = x_{n-k-1}$). Therefore, if $t \neq p - k$, then $C_n = xx_{p-k-d} \dots x_s x_t x_{t+1} \dots x_{n-k-1}x$ ($d := f(s + 1, t - 1)$), a contradiction. Hence, $t = p - k$ and this implies that $s = p - k - 2$. In particular, we also have

$$A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow C(p - k + 2, p - 1)) = \emptyset.$$

If $x_{p-k}x_{a+i} \in D$, where $i \in [1, n - 3]$, then $C_n = x_{p-k}x_{a+i}x_{a+i+1} \dots x_{a+n-3}xx_{p-k-i} \dots x_{p-k}$ by (17), a contradiction. Therefore

$$A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow C(a + 1, a + n - 3)) = \emptyset.$$

If $x_{p-k}x_i \in D$, where $i \in [1, a]$, then by Lemma 6(ii), $p - k = p - 1$ (i.e., $k = 1$ and $x_{p-k+1} = x_1$). Now from (17) and (*) we obtain that $a = 1$ and this completes the proof of Claim 7. $\square$

Claim 8. Either $\alpha \geq 2$ or $\gamma \geq 1$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $\alpha = 1$ and $\gamma = 0$. Then from (14) and Claim 6 we find that

$$id(x) \leq a + \beta \leq a + k.$$

Together with $id(x) \geq p/2 - 1$, $n \geq 5$, (28) and (29) this implies that

$$m \geq |B_1| = a + n + k - 4 \geq id(x) + n - 4.$$

Hence $id(x) = m - 1$, $\beta = k$, $n = 5$, $p = 2m$ and $|B_1| = m$. Therefore $x_q \rightarrow V(D) \setminus (B_1 \cup \{x_q\})$ by (29). Since $x \notin B_1$, we obtain $x_qx \in D$, $q = p - k - 1$ by (14), and $p - k - n = a + n - 3$ (in the converse case, we have $x_{p-k-n} \notin B_1$, $x_qx_{p-k-n} \in D$ and $C_n = x_qx_{p-k-n} \dots x_q$). Therefore $A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow B_1 \setminus \{x_{p-k+1}\}) = \emptyset$ by Claim 7. Using this together with $A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow \{x, x_{a+n-2}\}) = \emptyset$ and $|B_1 \setminus \{x_{p-k+1}\}| \geq m - 1$, we get that $od(x_{p-k}) \leq m - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 8 is proved. $\square$

Claim 9. The vertex x_q does not dominate at least $\gamma + 1$ vertices of $C(a + n - 2, p - k - n + 1)$.

Proof. First suppose that $\gamma = 0$. Then $\alpha \geq 2$ by Claim 8. Therefore there is an $i \in [1, n - 3]$ such that $x_{p-k-n+1+i}x \in D$. If $x_qx_{p-k-n+1} \in D$, then $C_n = x_qx_{p-k-n+1} \dots x_{p-k-n+i+1}xx_{q-n+i+3} \dots x_q$, a contradiction. Therefore $x_qx_{p-k-n+1} \notin D$, and for $\gamma = 0$ Claim 9 is true.

Now suppose that $\gamma \geq 1$. Then, since $x_{a+n-2}x \notin D$, it follows that $a + n - 2 \leq p - k - n$. If $x_ix \in D$ for some $i \in [a + n - 1, p - k - n + 1]$, then $A(x_q \rightarrow \{x_{i-1}, x_i\}) = \emptyset$ (for otherwise if $x_qx_i \in D$, then

$C_n = x_q x_i x x_{q-n+3} \dots x_q$ and if $x_q x_{i-1} \in D$, then $C_n = x_q x_{i-1} x_i x x_{q-n+4} \dots x_q$. Therefore, x_q does not dominate at least $\gamma+1$ vertices of $C(a+n-2, p-k-n+1)$ since $x_{a+n-2}x \notin D$, and so Claim 9 is proved. $\square$

Now we will complete the proof of Lemma 6 for Subcase 2.2.

First suppose that $q \geq p-k$. Then from Claims 1, 2, 4 and 9 it follows that x_q does not dominate at least $a+n+k+\gamma-3$ vertices of the cycle C . Since $x_q x \notin D$, we see that $m \geq a+n+k+\gamma-2$. From this and (30), we obtain

$$m \geq a+n+k+\gamma-2 \geq m+n-\alpha-2. \quad (31)$$

Then, since $\alpha \leq n-2$, it follows that $\alpha = n-2$ (i.e., $C(p-k-n+2, p-k-1) \rightarrow x$, $m = a+n+k+\gamma-2$) and x_q does not dominate exactly $\gamma+1$ vertices from $C(a+n-2, p-k-n+1)$ (i.e., if $\gamma \geq 1$ and $x_i \in C(a+n-2, p-k-n+1)$, then $x_q x_i \notin D$ if and only if $x_i x \in D$ or $x_{i+1}x \in D$). From this, since $k \geq 2$, $\gamma \geq 0$ and $a \geq 1$, by (31) we obtain $n \leq m-1$. Now using Claims 1, 2 and 4 we see that $A(x_q \rightarrow C(a+n-2, p-k-n+1)) \neq \emptyset$, because of $|C(p-k-n+2 + f(p-k, q), q)| \leq m-3$. Therefore there is an $i \in [a+n-2, p-k-n+1]$ such that $x_q x_i, x_{i+2}x \in D$. Thus we have a cycle $C_n = x_q x_i x_{i+1} x_{i+2} x x_{q-n+5} \dots x_q$, which is a contradiction.

Now suppose that $q = p-k-1$. Similarly as in Claim 9, one can show that x_{p-k} does not dominate at least $\gamma+1$ vertices from $C(a+n-2, p-k-n+1)$. By Claim 7, $s = p-k-2$, $t = p-k$, and

$$A(x_{p-k} \rightarrow B_1 \setminus \{x_{p-k+1}\}) = \emptyset.$$

Therefore, since $x_{p-k}x \notin D$ and $|B_1| = a+n+k-4$ by (28), it follows that x_{p-k} does not dominate at least $a+n+k+\gamma-3$ vertices. Hence $m \geq a+n+k+\gamma-3 \geq m+n-\alpha-3$ and $\alpha \geq n-3 \geq 2$ by (30). Therefore $x_{p-k}x_{p-k-n+2} \notin D$ (for otherwise we obtain a cycle C_n). Thus we see that x_{p-k} does not dominate at least $m+n-\alpha-2 \geq m$ vertices, since $\alpha \leq n-2$. It follows that $x_{p-k}x_{p-k-1} \in D$ and D contains a cycle $C_n := x x_{p-k-n+2} \dots x_{p-k-2} x_{p-k} x_{p-k-1} x$, which is a contradiction and completes the discussion of Subcase 2.2. Lemma 6 is proved. $\square$

Main Result

We first introduce the following notations.

Notation. For any positive integer m , let $H(m, m)$ denote the set of digraphs D on $2m$ vertices such that $V(D) = A \cup B$, $\langle A \rangle \equiv \langle B \rangle \equiv K_m^*$, $A(B \rightarrow A) = \emptyset$ and for every vertex $x \in A$ (respectively, $y \in B$) $A(x \rightarrow B) \neq \emptyset$ (respectively, $A(A \rightarrow y) \neq \emptyset$).

Notation. For any integer $m \geq 2$, let $H(m, m-1, 1)$ denote the set of digraphs D on $2m$ vertices such that $V(D) = A \cup B \cup \{a\}$, $|A| = |B| + 1 = m$, $A(\langle A \rangle) = \emptyset$, $\langle B \cup \{a\} \rangle \subseteq K_m^*$, $yz, zy \in D$ for each pair of vertices $y \in A$, $z \in B$ and either $I(a) = B$ and $a \rightarrow A$ or $O(a) = B$ and $A \rightarrow a$.

Notation. For any integer $m \geq 2$ define the digraph $H(2m)$ as follows: $V(H(2m)) = A \cup B \cup \{x, y\}$, $\langle A \rangle \equiv \langle B \rangle \equiv K_{m-1}^*$, $A(A, B) = \emptyset$, $O(x) = \{y\} \cup A$, $I(x) = O(y) = A \cup B$ and $I(y) = \{x\} \cup B$.

$H'(2m)$ is a digraph obtained from $H(2m)$ by adding the arc yx .

Theorem. Let D be a digraph on $p \geq 10$ vertices with the minimum degree at least $p-1$ and with minimum semi-degree at least $p/2-1$ ($m := \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$). Then D is pancyclic unless

$$K_{m,m+1}^* \subseteq D \subseteq (K_m + \overline{K_{m+1}})^* \quad \text{or} \quad p = 2m \quad \text{and} \quad G \subseteq K_{m,m}^*$$

or else

$$D \in H(m, m) \cup H(m, m-1, 1) \cup \{[(K_m \cup K_m) + K_1]^*, H(2m), H'(2m)\}$$

Proof. Suppose that the theorem is false, in particular, for some $n \in [3, p]$ the digraph D contains no cycle of length n . We recall that D is strong, hamiltonian and contains cycles of length 3, 4 and $p - 1$ (see [31] and [12]). So, we have $n \in [5, p - 2]$. Let $C := C_{p-1} := x_1 x_2 \dots x_{p-1} x_1$ be an arbitrary cycle of length $p - 1$ in D and let x be the vertex not containing in this cycle. From Lemmas 1 and 3 it follows that $d(x) = p - 1$, $m - 1 \leq id(x), od(x) \leq m$ and for each $i \in [1, p - 1]$,

$$xx_i \in D \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x_{i+n-2}x \notin D. \quad (*)$$

For the cycle C and for the vertex x we first prove the following claim:

Claim 1. There is a vertex x_i , $i \in [1, p - 1]$ (to be definite, let $x_i := x_{p-1}$) and there are positive integers k and a with $k + a \leq p - 2$ such that the following hold:

$$A(x, x_{p-1}) = \emptyset, \quad A(x, x_1) \neq \emptyset, \quad x_{p-k-1}x, \quad xx_a \in D$$

and

$$A(\{x_{p-k}, x_{p-k+1}, \dots, x_{p-1}\} \rightarrow x) = A(x \rightarrow (\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_a\} \setminus \{x_a\})) = \emptyset. \quad (32)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 5, we see that there is a vertex x_i , $i \in [1, p - 1]$, such that $A(x, x_i) = \emptyset$ and $A(x, x_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ (say $x_i := x_{p-1}$). Then there are positive integers a and k such that $xx_a, x_{p-k-1}x \in D$. We can choose a and k so that (32) holds. If $k + a \geq p - 1$, then from $od(x) = p - 1$ and (32) it follows that $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_a\} \rightarrow x \rightarrow \{x_a, x_{a+1}, \dots, x_{p-2}\}$. Hence, $C_n \subset D$ since $n \in [5, p - 2]$, a contradiction. Therefore, $k + a \leq p - 2$. Claim 1 is proved. $\square$

Claim 1 immediately implies that the conditions of Lemma 6 hold. Therefore $n \leq p - k - a + 2$ and

$$\text{if } p - k - 2 \leq i < j \leq p - 1, \quad \text{then } x_i x_j \in D \quad \text{if and only if } j = i + 1. \quad (33)$$

In particular, this implies that

$$A(C(p - k - 2, p - 3) \rightarrow x_{p-1}) = \emptyset. \quad (34)$$

Consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$, similarly to (34), one can show that

$$A(x_{p-1} \rightarrow C(2, a + 1)) = \emptyset. \quad (35)$$

Case 1. $n = p - k - a + 2$.

Then $n = p - k - a + 2 \leq p - 2$ implies that $k + a \geq 4$. From (*) and (32) it follows that

$$C(p - k - a, p - k - 1) \rightarrow x \rightarrow C(a, a + k - 1). \quad (36)$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $k \geq 2$ (otherwise we consider the digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$). It follows from statement (ii) of Lemma 6 that

$$A(x_{p-2} \rightarrow C(1, a)) = \emptyset. \quad (37)$$

From (34) and (35), we see that $x_{p-k-2}x_{p-1} \notin D$ and $x_{p-1}x_{a+1} \notin D$. Hence, since x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_{a+1}x_{a+2} \dots x_{p-k-2}$, using (34), (35), $d(x_{p-1}) \geq p - 1$ and Lemma 2(iii), we get that

$$C(1, a) \rightarrow x_{p-1} \rightarrow C(p - k - 1, p - 2) \quad \text{and} \quad d(x_{p-1}, C(a + 1, p - k - 2)) = n - 5, \quad (38)$$

in particular, $x_a x_{p-1}, x_{p-1} x_{p-k-1} \in D$. Therefore, by Lemma 2, there is an $l \in [a+1, p-k-2]$ such that $A(x_{p-1}, x_l) = \emptyset$ and $x_{l-1} x_{p-1}, x_{p-1} x_{l+1} \in D$. Let l with these properties be the smallest. By (36) and (38), $x x_{a+1}, x_{p-1} x_{p-2} \in D$. Therefore, since $x x_a, x_{p-k-1} x \in D$, if $x_{l-1} x_{p-2} \in D$, then $C_n = x x_a \dots x_{l-1} x_{p-2} x_{p-1} x_{l+1} \dots x_{p-k-1} x$, if $x_l x_{p-2} \in D$, then $C_n = x x_{a+1} \dots x_l x_{p-2} x_{p-1} x_{l+1} \dots x_{p-k-1} x$ and if $x_{p-2} x_{l+1} \in D$, then $C_n = x x_a \dots x_{l-1} x_{p-1} x_{p-2} x_{l+1} \dots x_{p-k-1} x$, a contradiction. So, we may assume that

$$A(\{x_{l-1}, x_l\} \rightarrow x_{p-2}) = A(x_{p-2} \rightarrow x_{l+1}) = \emptyset. \quad (39)$$

From Lemma 6(iii) it follows that

$$A(C(p-k-2, p-4) \rightarrow x_{p-2}) = \emptyset. \quad (40)$$

Suppose that $A(x_{p-2}, x_l) = \emptyset$. Since x_{p-2} cannot be inserted into the path $P := x_a x_{a+1} \dots x_{p-k-1}$ and $x_{p-2} x_a \notin D$ by (37), $x_{l-1} x_{p-2} \notin D$ by (39), using Lemma 2(iii), we see that

$$d(x_{p-2}, C(a, l-1)) \leq l-a-1. \quad (41)$$

Furthermore, using (39) and (40), similarly to (41), one can show that

$$d(x_{p-2}, C(l+1, p-k-1)) \leq \begin{cases} p-k-l-1, & \text{if } k=2, \\ p-k-l-2, & \text{if } k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Now by (37), (40), (41) and $x_{p-2} x \notin D$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{p-2}) &= d(x_{p-2}, C(1, a-1)) + d(x_{p-2}, C(a, l-1)) + d(x_{p-2}, C(l+1, p-k-1)) + \\ &\quad d(x_{p-2}, C(p-k, p-1)) + d(x_{p-2}, x) \leq p-2, \quad \text{a contradiction.} \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $A(x_{p-2}, x_l) \neq \emptyset$. It follows from (39) that $x_{p-2} x_l \in D$. Since $x_{p-k-1} x, x_{p-1} x_{p-2} \in D$ and (36), we have if $l \geq a+2$, then $C_n = x x_{a+1} \dots x_{l-1} x_{p-1} x_{p-2} x_l \dots x_{p-k-1} x$, a contradiction. Hence $l = a+1$. If $x_{p-k-2} x \in D$, then $C_n = x x_a x_{p-1} x_{p-2} x_l \dots x_{p-k-2} x$, a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $x_{p-k-2} x \notin D$. Then from (36) it follows that $a = 1$. Then $k \geq 3$. From (33) and (34), by Lemma 2, we obtain $d(x_{p-1}, C(3, p-k-1)) = p-k-3$. Using (34), (35), (38) and the minimality of $l = a+1$ it is easy to see that $A(C(2, p-3) \rightarrow x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$. Hence $id(x_{p-1}) \leq 2$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $n \leq p-k-a+1$.

Then from $x x_a \in D$ and (*) it follows that $n \leq p-k-a$ (i.e., $a \leq p-k-n$).

Notation. In the following let $P := x_a x_{a+1} \dots x_{p-k-1}$, $a := s_1$, $P_1 := x_{s_1} x_{s_1+1} \dots x_{s_1+n-3}$ and if $i \geq 2$, then $P_{i-1} := x_{s_{i-1}} x_{s_{i-1}+1} \dots x_{s_{i-1}+n-3}$. For $i \geq 2$ if $s_{i-1} + n - 3 \leq p-k-n+1$ and there is an $s_i \in [s_{i-1}+2, s_{i-1}+n-3]$ such that $x x_{s_i} \in D$ and $x x_{s_{i-1}} \notin D$, then let $P_i := x_{s_i} x_{s_i+1} \dots x_{s_i+n-3}$ (the integers s_i , $i \geq 1$, with these properties chosen is as large as possible). Let $r-1$ be the maximal number of these P_i paths and let $P_r := x_{p-k-n+2} x_{p-k-n+3} \dots x_{p-k-1}$. Since $n \leq p-k-a$, we have $r \geq 2$. If $s_{r-1} + n - 3 \geq p-k-n+2$, then we say that the path P is covered with paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_r$.

Note that each P_i path has length $n-3$. By the definition of s_i , $i \in [1, r]$, and (*) we have

$$x x_{s_i}, x_{s_i+n-3} x \in D, \quad x_{s_i+n-2} x \notin D \quad (42)$$

and $x x_{s_i} x_{s_i+1} \dots x_{s_i+n-3} x$ is a cycle of length $n-1$, where $s_r := p-k-n+2$.

We now divide the Case 2 into two subcases.

Subcase 2.1. The path P is covered with paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_r$.

Notation. In the following, let $A_0 := C(1, s_1)$, $A_1 := C(s_1 + 1, s_1 + n - 4)$, $A_{r+1} := C(p - k - 1, p - 2)$ and $A_i := C(s_{i-1} + n - 3, s_i + n - 4)$ if $i \in [2, r]$.

It is easy to see that $C(1, p - 2) = \cup_{i=0}^{r+1} A_i$ and $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for each pair of distinct $i, j \in [0, r + 1]$. From $n \geq 5$ and $C_n \not\subset D$ it follows that if $i \in [2, r]$, then $|A_i| = s_i - s_{i-1} \geq 2$ and if $i \in \{0, 1, r + 1\}$, then $|A_i| \geq 1$ ($|A_1| = n - 4$). It is not difficult to see that x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into no subpaths of P with vertices set A_i for all $i \in [1, r]$. Therefore, using (34), (35) and Lemma 2, we obtain

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \begin{cases} |A_i|, & \text{if } i \in \{1, r\} \\ |A_i| + 1, & \text{if } i \in [2, r - 1]. \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

First let us prove the following Claims 2-5.

Claim 2. $x_{p-1}x_{p-k-1} \in D$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $x_{p-1}x_{p-k-1} \notin D$. From (34) and (35) it is easy to see that $d(x_{p-1}, A_{r+1}) \leq |A_{r+1}|$ and $d(x_{p-1}, A_0) \leq |A_0| + 1$. Then, since $p - 2 = \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} |A_i|$ and

$$p - 1 \leq d(x_{p-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} d(x_{p-1}, A_i),$$

from (43) it follows that there is an $t \in \{0\} \cup [2, r - 1]$ such that $d(x_{p-1}, A_t) = |A_t| + 1$.

Suppose first that $t \in [2, r - 1]$. Then, since x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into the subpath $C[x_{s_{t-1}+n-3}, x_{s_t+n-4}]$, from $d(x_{p-1}, A_t) = |A_t| + 1$ and Lemma 2(ii) it follows that $x_{s_t+n-4}x_{p-1}$ and $x_{p-1}x_{s_{t-1}+n-3} \in D$. Therefore for each $i \in [1, t - 1]$ and for each $l \in [t, r]$ it is easy to see that

$$x_{s_i+n-4}x_{p-1} \notin D \quad \text{and} \quad x_{p-1}x_{s_l+n-3} \notin D. \quad (44)$$

Indeed, in the converse case, by (42) we have if $x_{s_i+n-4}x_{p-1} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{s_i}x_{s_i+1} \dots x_{s_i+n-4}x_{p-1}x_{s_{t-1}+n-3}x$ and if $x_{p-1}x_{s_l+n-3} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{s_t}x_{s_t+1} \dots x_{s_t+n-4}x_{p-1}x_{s_l+n-3}x$, a contradiction.

Using (34), (35), (44) and Lemma 2, we obtain

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \begin{cases} |A_i| - 1, & \text{if } i \in \{1, r\}, \\ |A_i|, & \text{if } i \in [2, r + 1] \setminus \{r, t\}, \\ |A_i| + 1, & \text{if } i \in \{0, t\}. \end{cases}$$

$$\text{Therefore } p - 1 \leq d(x_{p-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} |A_i| = p - 2, \quad \text{a contradiction.}$$

Now suppose that $t = 0$. Then from (35) and $d(x_{p-1}, A_0) = |A_0| + 1$ it follows that $A_0 \rightarrow x_{p-1}$. Hence $x_{p-1}x_{s_i+1} \notin D$ for each $i \in [1, r]$ (otherwise by (42), $C_n = xx_{s_1}x_{p-1}x_{s_i+1}x_{s_i+2} \dots x_{s_i+n-3}x$). Now we decompose the set $C(s_1 + 1, p - k - 2)$ into subsets B_i , where $B_i := C(s_i + 1, s_{i+1})$ if $i \in [1, r - 1]$ and $B_r := C(s_r + 1, s_r + n - 4)$. Note that x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into no subpaths of the path P with vertex set B_i . Therefore, using (34), $x_{p-1}x_{s_i+1} \notin D$, $x_{p-1}x_{p-k-1} \notin D$ and Lemma 2, we obtain

$$d(x_{p-1}, B_i) \leq \begin{cases} |B_i|, & \text{if } i \in [1, r - 1], \\ |B_i| - 1, & \text{if } i = r. \end{cases}$$

Hence it is not difficult to see that

$$p - 1 \leq d(x_{p-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^r d(x_{p-1}, B_i) + d(x_{p-1}, A_0 \cup A_{r+1}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r |B_i| + |A_0 \cup A_{r+1}| \leq p - 2,$$

which is a contradiction and completes the proof of Claim 2. $\square$

Claim 3. If $i \in [1, r]$, then $x_{s_i+n-4}x_{p-1} \notin D$.

Proof. Indeed, otherwise $x_{s_i+n-4}x_{p-1} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{s_i}x_{s_i+1} \dots x_{s_i+n-4}x_{p-1}x_{p-k-1}x$ by (42) and Claim 2, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 4. $x_{s_1}x_{p-1} \in D$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $x_{s_1}x_{p-1} \notin D$. Then from (35) it follows that $d(x_{p-1}, A_0) \leq |A_0|$. Since x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into no subpaths of P with vertex set A_i , $i \in [1, r]$, using (34), (35), Claim 3 and Lemma 2, we obtain

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \begin{cases} |A_i|, & \text{if } i \in \{0\} \cup [2, r], \\ |A_i| - 1, & \text{if } i = 1, \\ |A_i| + 1, & \text{if } i = r + 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$p - 1 \leq d(x_{p-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} |A_i| = p - 2, \quad \text{a contradiction.}$$

Claim 4 is proved. $\square$

Claim 5. If $i \in [1, r]$, then $x_{p-1}x_{s_i+1} \notin D$.

Proof. Indeed, otherwise $x_{p-1}x_{s_i+1} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{s_1}x_{p-1}x_{s_i+1} \dots x_{s_i+n-3}x$ by Claim 4 and (42), a contradiction. $\square$

From (34), (35), Claim 3 and Lemma 2 it follows that

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \begin{cases} |A_i| - 1, & \text{if } i = 1, \\ |A_i| + 1, & \text{if } i \in \{0, r + 1\}, \\ |A_i|, & \text{if } i \in [2, r]. \end{cases}$$

Therefore

$$p - 1 \leq d(x_{p-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} d(x_{p-1}, A_i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} |A_i| + 1 = p - 1.$$

It follows that $d(x_{p-1}) = p - 1$ and

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_i) = \begin{cases} |A_i| - 1, & \text{if } i = 1, \\ |A_i| + 1, & \text{if } i \in \{0, r + 1\}, \\ |A_i|, & \text{if } i \in [2, r]. \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

Using this together with (34), (35), Claim 3, the definitions of sets A_i and Lemma 2 it is not difficult to see that

$$A_0 \rightarrow x_{p-1} \rightarrow A_{r+1} \cup \{x_{s_1+n-3}, x_{s_2+n-3}, \dots, x_{s_r+n-3}\}. \quad (46)$$

Hence, by Claim 5, for all $i \in [2, r]$ we have $x_{s_i+1} \neq x_{s_{i-1}+n-3}$.

We will now prove the following:

Claim 6. $A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_1+1}, x_{s_1+3}, \dots, x_{p-k-2}\}) = \emptyset$ ($p - k - s_1$ is odd) and

$$\{x_{s_1}, x_{s_1+2}, \dots, x_{p-k-3}\} \rightarrow x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_{s_1+2}, x_{s_1+4}, \dots, x_{p-k-1}\}.$$

Proof. Using the definition of s_i , Claims 2-5, (46) and $d(x_{p-1}) = p - 1$ it is not difficult to show that for $n = 5$ Claim 6 is true.

Assume that $n \geq 6$. To prove Claim 6 for $n \geq 6$, it suffices to prove Claims 6.1-6.4.

Claim 6.1. If $l \in [1, r - 1]$, $i \in [s_l + 1, s_l + n - 4]$ and $x_{i-1}x_{p-1} \in D$, then $x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \notin D$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $l \in [1, r - 1]$, $i \in [s_l + 1, s_l + n - 4]$ and $x_{i-1}x_{p-1}, x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \in D$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that i is as maximal as possible. If $x_{s_l+n-1}x \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{s_l} \dots x_{i-1}x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \dots x_{s_l+n-1}x$, a contradiction. Therefore $x_{s_l+n-1}x \notin D$, and it follows from (*) that $xx_{s_l+1} \in D$. Hence $x_{s_l+n-3}x_{p-1} \notin D$ (otherwise by Claim 2, $C_n = xx_{s_l+1} \dots x_{s_l+n-3}x_{p-1}x_{p-k-1}x$). Since x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_{s_l+n-2}x_{s_l+n-1} \dots x_{s_l+1}x_{n-4}$, $d(x_{p-1}, A_{l+1}) = |A_{l+1}|$ by (45), and $x_{s_l+1+n-4}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by Claim 3, from Lemma 2 it follows that $x_{p-1}x_{s_l+n-2} \in D$. Therefore by Claim 5 and (46), $s_{l+1} \leq s_l + n - 5$ and $x_{s_l+1} \in A_l$.

Assume that $i \geq s_{l+1} - 1$. Since $xx_{s_{l+1}-1} \notin D$ (by the definition of s_i) and $xx_{s_l} \in D$, we see that there is an $t \in [s_l + 1, s_{l+1} - 2]$ such that $xx_t \in D$ and $xx_{t+1} \notin D$. Therefore $x_{t+n-1}x \in D$ by (*), and $C_n = xx_t x_{t+1} \dots x_{i-1}x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \dots x_{t+n-1}x$, a contradiction.

Now assume that $i \leq s_{l+1} - 2$. Since $x_{s_{l+1}} \in A_l$, $x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_{s_l+n-3}, x_{s_l+n-2}\}$, $x_{p-1}x_{s_{l+1}+1} \notin D$ by Claim 5, and the path $x_{s_{l+1}}x_{s_{l+1}+1} \dots x_{s_l+n-3}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , there is an $k \in [s_{l+1} + 2, s_l + n - 3]$ such that $x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{s_l+n-2}\}$ and $A(x_{p-1}, x_{k-1}) = \emptyset$. From the maximality of i it follows that $x_{k-2}x_{p-1} \notin D$. Let $l = 1$. Then, since the path $x_{s_1+1} \dots x_{s_1+n-4}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , by Lemma 2 we obtain

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_1) = d(x_{p-1}, C(s_1 + 1, k - 2)) + d(x_{p-1}, C(k, s_1 + n - 4)) \leq |A_1| - 2,$$

which contradicts (45). Let now $l \geq 2$. Then, since x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into the path $x_{s_{l-1}+n-3}x_{s_{l-1}+n-2} \dots x_{s_l+n-4}$, by Lemma 2(ii) we have

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_l) = d(x_{p-1}, C(s_{l-1} + n - 3, k - 2)) + d(x_{p-1}, C(k, s_l + n - 4)) \leq s_l - s_{l-1} - 1 = |A_l| - 1,$$

which also contradicts (45). Claim 6.1 is proved. $\square$

Claim 6.2. If $l \in [1, r - 1]$, then $A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_{l-1}+n-2}, x_{s_{l-1}+n}, \dots, x_{s_l+n-4}\}) = \emptyset$ ($s_l - s_{l-1}$ is even) and

$$\{x_{s_{l-1}+n-3}, x_{s_{l-1}+n-1}, \dots, x_{s_l+n-5}\} \rightarrow x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_{s_{l-1}+n-3}, x_{s_{l-1}+n-1}, \dots, x_{s_l+n-5}, x_{s_l+n-3}\},$$

where $s_0 + n - 3 := s_1 + 2$.

Proof. Note that for all $i \in [s_1, p - k - 2]$,

$$|A(x_i \rightarrow x_{p-1})| + |A(x_{p-1} \rightarrow x_{i+1})| \leq 1, \quad (47)$$

since x_{p-1} cannot be inserted into no subpath of P with vertex set A_l , $l \in [1, r]$.

We prove Claim 6.2 by induction on l . Assume that $l = 1$. We first show the following statement:

(a). For all $i \in [s_1, s_1 + n - 4]$ the vertex x_{p-1} is adjacent at most with one vertex from $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$.

Proof of (a). Suppose that Statement (a) is not true. Then for some $i \in [s_1, s_1 + n - 4]$ the vertex x_{p-1} is adjacent with x_i and x_{i+1} . Then by (47), we only need to consider the following three cases:

- (i) $x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$; (ii) $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} \rightarrow x_{p-1}$; (iii) $x_{p-1}x_i, x_{i+1}x_{p-1} \in D$.

We show that all these cases cannot occur.

(i) $x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$. Let i with these properties be the smallest. From Claims 4 and 5 we have $x_{p-1}x_{s_1+1} \notin D$ and $x_{s_1}x_{p-1} \in D$. Therefore $i \geq s_1 + 4$ by Claim 6.1. Now from (47), Claim 6.1

and the minimality of i it follows that $A(x_{p-1}, x_{i-1}) = \emptyset$, $x_{i-2}x_{p-1} \notin D$. Hence, since the paths $Q_1 := x_{s_1+1}x_{s_1+2} \dots x_{i-2}$ and $Q_2 := x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{s_1+n-4}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} and $x_{p-1}x_{s_1+1} \notin D$ (Claim 5), $x_{s_1+n-4}x_{p-1} \notin D$ (Claim 3), using Lemma 2, we obtain

$$d(x_{p-1}, A_1) = d(x_{p-1}, Q_1) + d(x_{p-1}, Q_2) \leq |Q_1| - 1 + |Q_2| = |A_1| - 2,$$

which contradicts (45).

Similarly we obtain a contradiction for the cases (ii) and (iii). Statement (a) is proved.

From statement (a) and Claims 3, 5 it follows that $A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_1+1}, x_{s_1+n-4}\}) = \emptyset$. Therefore by Lemma 4b and $d(x_{p-1}, A_1) = |A_1| - 1$ (by (45)) we have n is odd and

$$A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_1+1}, x_{s_1+3}, \dots, x_{s_1+n-4}\}) = \emptyset, \quad O(x_{p-1}, A_1) = I(x_{p-1}, A_1) = \{x_{s_1+2}, x_{s_1+4}, \dots, x_{s_1+n-5}\}.$$

Hence Claim 6.2 is true for $l = 1$.

Now assume that Claim 6.2 holds for $l - 1$, $2 \leq l \leq r - 1$, and prove it for l . By (46), $x_{p-1}x_{s_{l-1}+n-3}$, $x_{p-1}x_{s_l+n-3} \in D$, and by the inductive assumption, $x_{s_{l-1}+n-5}x_{p-1} \in D$. Therefore by Claim 6.1, $x_{p-1}x_{s_{l-1}+n-2} \notin D$. Now similarly to Statement (a) we can prove the following Statement (b):

(b). For all $i \in [s_{l-1} + n - 3, s_l + n - 4]$, x_{p-1} is adjacent with at most one vertex from $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$.

From (46) and statement (b) it follows that $A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_{l-1}+n-2}, x_{s_l+n-4}\}) = \emptyset$. Now from Lemma 4b, since $d(x_{p-1}, A_l) = |A_l|$ by (45), it follows that for all $l \in [2, r - 1]$, $s_l - s_{l-1}$ is even and

$$A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_{l-1}+n-2}, x_{s_{l-1}+n}, \dots, x_{s_l+n-4}\}) = \emptyset,$$

$$O(x_{p-1}, A_l) = I(x_{p-1}, A_l) = \{x_{s_{l-1}+n-3}, x_{s_{l-1}+n-1}, \dots, x_{s_l+n-5}\}.$$

Claim 6.2 for $2 \leq l \leq r - 1$ is proved and this completes the proof of Claim 6.2. $\square$

Claim 6.3. If $i \in [s_r + 1, s_r + n - 5]$ and $x_{i-1}x_{p-1} \in D$, then $x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \notin D$.

Proof. Suppose that $i \in [s_r + 1, s_r + n - 5]$ and $x_{i-1}x_{p-1}, x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \in D$. If $xx_{s_r-2} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{s_r-2}x_{s_r-1} \dots x_{i-1}x_{p-1}x_{i+2} \dots x_{p-k-1}x$, a contradiction. Hence $xx_{s_r-2} \notin D$ and $x_{s_r+n-4}x \in D$ by (*). From Claims 3 and 6.1 it follows that $i \geq s_{r-1} + n - 2$. Let $d := f(s_r, s_{r-1} + n - 4)$. Therefore, since $x_{p-1}x_{s_{r-1}+n-3} \in D$ by (46), if d is even, then $C_n = x_{s_1}x_{s_1+1} \dots x_{s_1+d}x_{p-1}x_{s_{r-1}+n-3} \dots x_{s_r+n-4}x$ and if d is odd, then $C_n = x_{s_1}x_{s_1+1} \dots x_{s_1+d-1}x_{p-1}x_{s_r+n-3} \dots x_{p-k-1}x$ by Claim 6.2 and (46), a contradiction. Claim 6.3 is proved. $\square$

Claim 6.4. $A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_{r-1}+n-2}, x_{s_{r-1}+n}, \dots, x_{s_r+n-4}\}) = \emptyset$ ($s_r - s_{r-1}$ is even) and

$$\{x_{s_{r-1}+n-3}, x_{s_{r-1}+n-1}, \dots, x_{s_r+n-5}\} \rightarrow x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_{s_{r-1}+n-3}, x_{s_{r-1}+n-1}, \dots, x_{s_r+n-5}, x_{s_r+n-3}\}.$$

Proof. From Claim 6.2 we have $x_{s_{r-1}+n-5}x_{p-1} \in D$. Hence, $x_{p-1}x_{s_{r-1}+n-2} \notin D$ by Claim 6.1. Then, since $d(x_{p-1}, A_r) = |A_r|$ by (45), $x_{p-k-2}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by (34), using Lemma 2 we obtain $x_{s_{r-1}+n-3}x_{p-1} \in D$. Again using Lemma 2, Claim 6.3 and (45), similarly to Statement (a), we can prove the following statement:

(c). For all $i \in [s_{r-1} + n - 3, s_r + n - 4]$, x_{p-1} is adjacent with at most one vertex from $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$.

By (46), $x_{p-1} \rightarrow \{x_{s_{r-1}+n-3}, x_{s_r+n-3}\}$. Therefore, $A(x_{p-1}, \{x_{s_{r-1}+n-2}, x_{s_r+n-4}\}) = \emptyset$ by Statement (c). Together with (45) and Lemma 4b this implies that

$$O(x_{p-1}, A_r) = I(x_{p-1}, A_r) = \{x_{s_{r-1}+n-3}, x_{s_{r-1}+n-1}, \dots, x_{s_r+n-5}\}.$$

Claim 6.4 is proved and hence the proof of Claim 6 is completed. $\square$

From Claim 6, $d(x_{p-1}) = p - 1$, $\delta^o(x_{p-1}) \geq p/2 - 1$ and (46) it follows that

$$|k - s_1| \leq 1. \quad (48)$$

Claim 7. $s_1 := a = 1$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $a \geq 2$. Then $x_1x \in D$ and from Claim 6 it follows that

$$\{x_{a+n-5}, x_{a+n-3}\} \rightarrow x_{p-1}. \quad (49)$$

From this it is easy to see that $a \geq 3$ (otherwise $a = 2$, $a + n - 3 = n - 1$ and $C_n = x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}x_{p-1}x_1$). If $x_2x \in D$ or $xx_{a+1} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_ax_{a+1} \dots x_{a+n-5}x_{p-1}x_1x_2x$ or $C_n = xx_{a+1} \dots x_{a+n-3}x_{p-1}x_1x$ by (49), a contradiction. So we may assume that $a \geq 3$, $x_2x \notin D$ and $xx_{a+1} \notin D$. Together with (32) this implies that $d(x, C(1, a + 1)) \leq a + 1$. By Claim 6, $x_{p-1}x_{a+2} \in D$, and it is easy to see that the cycle $C' := x_{p-1}x_{a+2}x_{a+3} \dots x_{p-2}x_{p-1}$ has length at least $n - 1$. Using Lemma 1 we obtain that $d(x, V(C')) = |V(C')|$, $d(x, C(1, a + 1)) = a + 1$ and $x_{a+1}x \in D$. Hence it is clear that $x_3x \in D$. From (48) and $a \geq 3$ we also have $k \geq 2$. Then by (*), $xx_{s_r+1} \in D$. If $n \geq 6$, then $C_n = xx_{s_r+1}x_{s_r+2} \dots x_{p-k-3}x_{p-1}x_1x_2x_3x$ by Claim 6, a contradiction. So, we may assume that $n = 5$. It is easy to see that $a = 3$ and $x_4x \in D$ (if $a \geq 4$, then by (46) $x_4x_{p-1} \in D$ and $C_5 = x_{p-1}x_1x_2x_3x_4x_{p-1}$). Since $n = 5$ and the path P is covered with paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_r$ it follows that $x \rightarrow \{x_3, x_5, \dots, x_{p-k-3}\}$. It is not difficult to see that if $x_ix_2 \in D$ for some $i \in [5, p - k - 2]$, then $C_5 = xx_ix_2x_3x_4x$ or $C_5 = xx_{i-1}x_ix_2x_3x$ respectively for odd i and for even i , a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $A(\{x_5, x_6, \dots, x_{p-k-2}\} \rightarrow x_2) = \emptyset$. Together with Lemma 6(ii), (35) and $xx_2 \notin D$ this implies that $I(x_2) \subseteq \{x_3, x_4, x_1\}$ (i.e., $id(x_2) \leq 3$), a contradiction. Claim 11 is proved. $\square$

Claim 8. $k = 1$.

Proof. Suppose that Claim 8 is false, that $k \geq 2$. Then from (48) and Claim 7 it is easy to see that $k = 2$. Note that $x_{p-3}x \in D$ and $x_{p-2}x_1 \notin D$. By Claim 6, $x_{p-1}x_3 \in D$. Hence if $x_1x_{p-2} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_1x_{p-2}x_{p-1}x_3 \dots x_{n-2}x$ by (42), a contradiction. Thus $A(x_1, x_{p-2}) = \emptyset$. By (46), $x_{p-1}x_{p-3}$ and $x_{p-1}x_{n-2} \in D$. Now from $x_{p-1}x_{n-2} \in D$ and Claim 6 it follows that $x_{n-2}x_{p-1} \in D$. Therefore if $x_{p-2}x_2 \in D$, then $C_n = x_2x_3 \dots x_{n-2}x_{p-1}x_{p-3}x_{p-2}x_2$, a contradiction. So we may assume that $x_{p-2}x_2 \notin D$. Then, since $x_{p-4}x_{p-2} \notin D$ by (33), and the path $x_2x_3 \dots x_{p-4}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-2} (otherwise some P_i , $i \in [1, r]$, path can be extended with x_{p-2} and $C_n \subset D$), from Lemma 2 it follows that $d(x_{p-2}, \{x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{p-4}\}) \leq p - 6$. Now from $d(x_{p-2}) \geq p - 1$, $x_{p-2}x \notin D$ and $A(x_{p-2}, x_1) = \emptyset$ we obtain that $x_{p-1}x_{p-2}$ and $x_{p-2}x_{p-3} \in D$. By Claim 6 we also have $x_{n-4}x_{p-1} \in D$. Therefore $C_n = xx_1x_2 \dots x_{n-4}x_{p-1}x_{p-2}x_{p-3}x$, a contradiction. Claim 8 is proved. $\square$

Now we shall complete the discussion of Case 2.1.

Using the Claims 6-8 it is not difficult to see that $p = 2m + 1$ and n is odd (if n is even, then by Claim 6, $x_{n-1}x_{p-1} \in D$ and $C_n = x_{p-1}x_1x_2 \dots x_{n-1}x_{p-1}$). Now we consider the cycle $C' := xx_1x_2 \dots x_{p-2}x$ of the length $p - 1$. It is easy to see that for this cycle C' we have the considered Subcase 1.2. Then analogously to Claim 6, we obtain

$$\{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{p-2}\} \rightarrow x \rightarrow \{x_1, x_3, \dots, x_{p-2}\}, \quad A(x, \{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{p-3}\}) = \emptyset \quad \text{and}$$

$$A(\langle \{x, x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{p-3}, x_{p-1}\} \rangle) = \emptyset, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad K_{m,m+1}^* \subseteq D \subseteq (K_m + \overline{K_{m+1}})^*$$

This contradicts our initial supposition, and completes the discussion of Case 2.1.

Case 2.2. The path P cannot be covered with paths $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{r-1}, P_r$. Then $n \leq m + 1$.

Remark. It is easy to see that in digraph $\overleftarrow{D}$ the path $x_{p-k-1}x_{p-k-2}\dots x_{s_1+1}x_{s_1}$ also cannot be covered with corresponding paths. Therefore in the further we assume that $id(x) = \lfloor p/2 \rfloor := m$.

For convenience, in the following let $q := s_{r-1}$. From the maximality of q it follows that if $x_j \in P_q$ and $xx_j \in D$, then $x \rightarrow C(q, j)$. Since $xx_{p-k-n+1} \notin D$, $xx_q \in D$ and $q + n - 3 \leq p - k - n + 1$, there is an $s \in [q, p - k - n]$ such that

$$xx_{s+1} \notin D \quad \text{and} \quad x \rightarrow C(q, s). \quad (50)$$

Therefore

$$x_{s+n-1}x \in D \quad \text{and} \quad A(C(q + n - 2, s + n - 2) \rightarrow x) = \emptyset \quad \text{by } (*). \quad (51)$$

Subcase 2.2.1. $s \geq q + n - 3$.

Then $f(q, s) \geq n - 2$ and from (50), (51) it follows that

$$A(x_{s+1} \rightarrow C(s + 3, s + n - 2)) = \emptyset, \quad (52)$$

(otherwise $i \in [0, n - 5]$, $x_{s+1}x_{s+3+i} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{s-i}x_{s-i+1}\dots x_{s+1}x_{s+i+3}\dots x_{s+n-1}x$ by (50) and (51)). If $z \in C(s + n - 1, p - 1) \cup C(1, s - n + 3)$ and $zx \in D$, then $x_{s+1}z \notin D$ (otherwise $C_n = xx_{s-n+4}x_{s-n+5}\dots x_{s+1}zx$ by (50)). From this and (51) it follows that x_{s+1} does not dominate at least $id(x) - id(x, C(s - n + 4, q + n - 3))$ vertices from the set $C(s + n - 1, p - 1) \cup C(1, s - n + 3)$. Therefore, since $x_{s+1}x \notin D$, $f(s + 3, s + n - 2) = n - 4$ and (52), we have

$$id(x) - id(x, C(s - n + 4, q + n - 3)) + n - 3 \leq m.$$

Hence

$$n - 3 \leq m - id(x) + id(x, C(s - n + 4, q + n - 3)).$$

Together with $id(x) = m$ and $id(x, C(s - n + 4, q + n - 3)) \leq n - 3$ this implies that $id(x, C(s - n + 4, q + n - 3)) = n - 3$. Hence $s = q + n - 3$ and $C(q + 1, q + n - 3) \rightarrow x$. Now from $q \geq 1$ and $x_{p-1}x \notin D$ we obtain that there is an $i \in [1, q + 1]$ such that $x_i x \in D$ and $x_{i-1}x \notin D$. By our arguments above we have $x_{s+1}x_{i-1} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{q+2}\dots x_{s+1}x_{i-1}x_i x$, a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2.2. $s \leq q + n - 4$.

From the definition of s and (*) immediately follows the following:

Claim 9. (i) $A(x \rightarrow C(s + 1, q + n - 3)) = \emptyset$ and (ii) $C(s + n - 1, q + 2n - 5) \rightarrow x$. $\square$

Let $h_1 := f(q, s - 1)$ and $h_2 := f(s, q + n - 3)$. Note that $0 \leq h_1 \leq n - 4$, $h_2 \geq 2$ and $h_1 + h_2 = n - 2$.

Notation. Let Y denote the set of vertices $x_i \in C(q + n - 1, p - 1) \cup C(1, q - 1)$ for which there is a vertex $x_j \in C(s + n - 1, p - 1) \cup C(1, s - 1)$ such that $x_j x \in D$ and the path $x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_j$ has at most $h_1 + 1$ vertices.

From Claim 13 and $f(q + n - 1, s + n - 2) = h_1$ it follows that $C(q + n - 1, s + n - 2) \subset Y$.

Claim 10. $A(x_{q+n-3} \rightarrow Y) = \emptyset$ and $|Y| \leq m$.

Proof. Suppose that $A(x_{q+n-3} \rightarrow Y) \neq \emptyset$, that is $x_{q+n-3}x_i \in D$ for some $x_i \in Y$. Then by the definition of Y there is a vertex $x_j \in C(s + n - 1, p - 1) \cup C(1, s - 1)$ such that $x_j x \in D$ and the path $x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_j$ contains at most $h_1 + 1$ vertices. Therefore $C_n = x_{q+n-3}x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_j x x_{q+d-1} x_{q+d} \dots x_{q+n-3}$ by (50), where $d := |\{x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_j\}|$, a contradiction. This proves that $A(x_{q+n-3} \rightarrow Y) = \emptyset$. Hence

it is clear that $|Y| \leq m$. The claim is proved. $\square$

Notation. For each $t \in [0, h_2 - 1]$ let R_t denote the set of vertices $x_i \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 5)$ for which $x_{i-t} \notin C(q + n - 2, s + n - 1)$ and $xx_{i-t} \in D$, and let $Z := \cup_{t=0}^{h_2-2} R_t$.

Claim 11. If $t \in [0, h_2 - 2]$, then $A(R_t \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}) = \emptyset$ (i.e., $A(Z \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}) = \emptyset$) and $|Z| \leq m$.

Proof. Suppose that the claim is false, that is $t \in [0, h_2 - 2]$ and there is a vertex $x_i \in R_t$ such that $x_i x_{q+n-2} \in D$. By the definition of R_t we have $xx_{i-t} \in D$ and, by Claim 9(ii), $x_{q+2n-5-t}x \in D$. Therefore $C_n = xx_{i-t} \dots x_i x_{q+n-2} \dots x_{q+2n-5-t}x$, a contradiction. The claim is proved. $\square$

Claim 12. If $x_{p-1} \in Y \cup Z$, then $n < p - m$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $x_{p-1} \in Y \cup Z$ and $n \geq p - m$. Therefore $m + 1 \geq n \geq m$.

We first prove that $q = s_1$ (i.e., $s_1 = s_{r-1}$ and $r = 2$). Assume that $q \neq s_1$. By the definition of s_i we have $s_{i-1} \leq s_i - 2$. Hence $1 \leq s_1 \leq q - 2$ and $q \geq 3$. Then $p - 1 \geq 2n + k + q - 5$ since $q + n - 3 \leq p - k - n + 1$. From this and $m + 1 \geq n \geq m$ it is not difficult to see that $n = m$. Since $n \geq p - m$, we obtain $p = 2m$, $k = s_1 = 1$, $q = 3$ and $q + n - 2 = p - k - n + 2 = m + 1$. From $C_n \not\subset D$ it is easy to see that $x_{p-1}x_m \notin D$ and $x_{m-1}x_{p-1} \notin D$. It follows from (34) and (35) that $x_{p-3}x_{p-1} \notin D$ and $x_{p-1}x_2 \notin D$. Then, since the paths $x_2x_3 \dots x_{m-1}$ and $P_r = x_{m+1}x_{m+2} \dots x_{p-2}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , using Lemma 2, (34), (35) and $d(x_{p-1}) \geq 2m - 1$ we see that $x_{p-1}x_{m+1}$, $x_{p-1}x_{p-2}$, x_mx_{p-1} , $x_1x_{p-1} \in D$. Therefore if $x_{p-3}x \in D$, then $C_n = xx_1x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-3}x$ and if $x_{p-3}x \notin D$, then $xx_{m-1} \in D$ (i.e., $s = m - 1$) by (*), $xx_4 \in D$ by (50), and $C_n = xx_4x_5 \dots x_mx_{p-1}x_{p-2}x$, a contradiction. This proves that $q = s_1$.

Let $n = m + 1$ and $p = 2m$. Then $k = s_1 = 1$ and $n - 2 = p - k - n + 1 = m - 1$. It is easy to see that $x_mx_{p-1} \notin D$. If $x_{p-1} \in Y$, then $x_{m-1}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by Claim 10, if $x_{p-1} \in Z$, then $x_{p-1}x_m \notin D$ by Claim 11, and $A(x_m, x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$. Therefore, since the paths P_1 and P_r cannot be extended with x_{p-1} and $x_{p-1}x_2 \notin D$ by (34), $x_{p-3}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by (35), using Lemma 2 we obtain that x_1x_{p-1} , $x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_1x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-2}x$, a contradiction.

Let now $n = m + 1$ and $p = 2m + 1$. It is easy to see that $A(x_m, x_{p-1}) = \emptyset$, $1 \leq k, s_1 \leq 2$. By (34) and (35), $x_{p-3}x_{p-1} \notin D$ and $x_{p-1}x_2 \notin D$. Therefore, since $d(x_{p-1}) \geq p - 1$ and the paths $x_2x_3 \dots x_{m-1}$ and $x_{m+1}x_{m+2} \dots x_{p-3}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , using Lemma 2 we get that x_1x_{p-1} , $x_{m-1}x_{p-1}$, $x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \in D$. If $s_1 = 2$, then $x_1x, xx_2 \in D$ and $C_n = x_{m-1}x_{p-1}x_1xx_2 \dots x_{m-1}x$, a contradiction. So we may assume that $s_1 = 1$. Then $xx_1 \in D$, and since $s \leq q + n - 4 = m - 2$, $xx_{m-1} \notin D$. Hence $x_{p-3}x \in D$ by (*), and $C_n = xx_1x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-3}x$, a contradiction.

Let finally $n = m$. From $n \geq p - m$ it follows that $p = 2m$, $1 \leq k \leq 3$ and $1 \leq s_1 = q \leq 3$. Since $C_n \not\subset D$, it is easy to see that

$$x_{m-1}x_{p-1} \notin D \quad \text{and} \quad x_{p-1}x_m \notin D. \quad (53)$$

Now we shall consider the cases $k = 3$, $k = 2$ and $k = 1$ separately.

Case. $k = 3$. Then $q = s_1 = 1$ ($x_{q+n-3} = x_{m-2}$) and $x_{p-4}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by (34). Hence, since the paths $x_1x_2 \dots x_{m-2}$ and $x_{m-1} \dots x_{p-4}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , from Lemma 2, (53) and (34) it follows that $x_{m-2}x_{p-1}$, $x_{p-1}x_{m-1} \in D$, which contradicts Claim 10 or 11.

Case. $k = 2$. Then $p - k - n + 2 = m$ and $s_1 \leq 2$. Let $s_1 = 2$. Then, since $x_{p-3}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by (34), $x_{p-1}x_2 \notin D$ by (35), and the paths $x_2x_3 \dots x_{m-1}$ and $x_mx_{m+1} \dots x_{p-3}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , using (53) and Lemma 2(iii), we get that $d(x_{p-1}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction. If $s_1 = 1$, then again using (34), (53) and Lemma 2, we obtain $x_{m-2}x_{p-1}$, $x_{p-1}x_{m-1} \in D$, which also contradicts Claim 10 or 11.

Case. $k = 1$. Then $p - k - n + 2 = m + 1$ and $1 \leq s_1 \leq 3$.

If $s_1 = 3$, then $xx_3 \in D$ and, since the paths $x_3x_4 \dots x_m$ and $x_{m+1}x_{m+2} \dots x_{p-3}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} , using (34), (35), (53) and Lemma 2, we obtain $x_{p-1}x_{p-2}, x_mx_{p-1}, x_3x_{p-1}, x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \in D$. Therefore, if $xx_4 \in D$, then $C_n = xx_4 \dots x_mx_{p-1}x_{p-2}x$ and if $xx_4 \notin D$, then by (*) and the definition of s we have $x_{p-3}x \in D$ and $C_n = xx_3x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-3}x$, a contradiction.

If $s_1 = 2$, then $xx_2 \in D$. Using (35), (53) and Lemma 2, we obtain $x_2x_{p-1}, x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \in D$. From $s \leq q + n - 4$ it follows that $xx_{m-1} \notin D$. Then by (*), $x_{p-3}x \in D$ ($p - 3 = 2m - 3$) and $C_n = xx_2x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-3}x$, a contradiction.

Now assume that $s_1 = 1$. If $x_{p-1} \in Y$, then $x_{m-2}x_{p-1} \notin D$ by Claim 10, and if $x_{p-1} \in Z$, then $x_{p-1}x_{m-1} \notin D$ by Claim 11. Since the paths $x_1x_2 \dots x_{m-2}$ and $x_{m+1}x_{m+2} \dots x_{p-2}$ cannot be extended with x_{p-1} and $d(x_{p-1}) \geq p - 1$, using (34), (35), (53) and Lemma 2, we obtain $x_{p-1}x_{m+1}, x_1x_{p-1}, x_mx_{p-1} \in D$. Therefore, if $xx_{m-1} \notin D$, then by (*), $x_{p-3}x \in D$ and $C_n = xx_1x_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-3}x$ and if $xx_{m-1} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{m-1}x_mx_{p-1}x_{m+1} \dots x_{p-4}x$ since $x_{p-4}x \in D$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 12. $\square$

Claim 13. Let $x_i \in C(q + n - 2, p - 1) \cup C(1, q - 1)$ and $xx_i \in D$. Then

(i) $x_{i+n-3}x_{q+n-3} \notin D$ and (ii) if $x_{q+n-3}x_{q+d} \in D$, where $d \in [0, n - 4]$, then $x_{i+d}x_{q+n-3} \notin D$.

Proof. Assume that the claim is not true. Then (i) $x_{i+n-3}x_{q+n-3} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_ix_{i+1} \dots x_{i+n-3}x_{q+n-3}x$; (ii) $x_{i+d}x_{q+n-3} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_ix_{i+1} \dots x_{i+d}x_{q+n-3}x_{q+d} \dots x_{q+n-4}x$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 14. If $xx_{q+n-4} \notin D$ (i.e., $s \leq q + n - 5$), then $A(C(q, s) \rightarrow x_{q+n-3}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. By (*), $x_{q+2n-6}x \in D$. If the claim is not true, then $x_ix_{q+n-3} \in D$, where $x_i \in C(q, s)$, and $xx_i \in D$ by (50). Hence $C_n = xx_ix_{q+n-3}x_{q+n-2} \dots x_{q+2n-6}x$, a contradiction. $\square$

Notation. For all $j \in [1, n - 2]$ let H_j denote the set of vertices $x_i \notin \{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}\}$ for which $x_{i+j-1} \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 5)$ and $x_{i+j-1}x \in D$.

Claim 15. If $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$ and $x_{q+2n-4-j}x_{q+n-2} \in D$, where $j \in [1, n - 3]$, then $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow H_j) = \emptyset$.

Proof. If the claim is not true, then $x_{q+n-2}x_i \in D$, where $x_i \in H_j$, and $C_n = xx_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-4-j}x_{q+n-2}x_i \dots x_{i+j-1}x$, a contradiction. $\square$

Further, let $\alpha_1 := |O(x) \cap C(q + n - 2, s + n - 1)|$ and $\alpha_2 := |O(x) \cap C(s + n, q + 2n - 5)|$.

Note that $\alpha_1 \leq h_1 + 2$ and $\alpha_2 \leq h_2 - 2$.

Claim 16. $s \geq q + 1$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $s = q$. Then $h_2 = n - 2 \geq 3$ and $\alpha_1 \leq 2$. By Claim 9(ii),

$$C(q + n - 1, q + 2n - 5) \rightarrow x, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad |I(x) \cap \{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}, \dots, x_{q+2n-5}\}| = n - 3. \quad (54)$$

Note that if $x_i \notin C(q + n - 1, q + 2n - 5)$ and $x_ix \in D$, then $x_i \in H_1$ and $x_{i-1} \in H_2$. Therefore $|H_1| = |H_2| = m - n + 3$ by $id(x) = m$ and (54). From $id(x) = m$ it follows that there is a vertex $x_j \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 4)$ such that $x_jx \notin D$. From this we obtain that the set $\cup_{i=2}^{n-2} H_i$ (respectively, $\cup_{i=1, i \neq 2}^{n-2} H_i$) contains at least $n - 3$ vertices which are not in H_1 (respectively, H_2). Now it is not difficult to show the following inequalities:

$$\text{a). } \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-2} H_j \right| \geq m \quad \text{and} \quad \text{b). } \text{if } i \in [1, n - 2], \quad \text{then} \quad \left| \bigcup_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n-2} H_j \right| \geq m - 1 \quad (55)$$

and

$$\text{if } xx_{q+n-2} \in D, xx_{q+n-1} \notin D, \text{ then } \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-3} H_j \right| \geq m. \quad (56)$$

From $xx_{q-1} \notin D$, $s = q$, Claim 9(i) and $p \geq 10$ it follows that

$$O(x) \cap \{x_{q+n}, x_{q+n+1}, \dots, x_{q-2}\} \neq \emptyset.$$

By Claim 9(i) and the definitions of α_1, α_2 we have

$$od(x, C(q+2n-4, p-1) \cup C(1, q)) = od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2.$$

Therefore $|R_0| = od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2$ and $|R_1| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2$. Note that

$$\{x_{q+1}, x_{q+2}, \dots, x_{q+n-3}\} \subset \bigcup_{t=1}^{n-3} R_t.$$

Now it is not difficult to see that for each $j \in [0, 1]$ the following inequality holds

$$\left| \bigcup_{t=j}^{n-4+j} R_t \setminus \{x_{q+2n-5+j}\} \right| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + n - 3. \quad (57)$$

We now distinguish several cases.

Case 1. $xx_{q+n-2} \notin D$. Then $\alpha_1 \leq 1$ and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq n - 3$. From Claim 11 and (57) it follows that

$$m \geq \left| \bigcup_{t=0}^{n-4} R_t \right| + 1 \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + n - 2.$$

Now it is easy to see that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = n - 3$, (in particular, $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$), $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$ and by Claim 11, $id(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m - 1$ and $C(q+n-1, q+2n-5) \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}$. Therefore Claim 15 holds. On the other hand, by (55b) we have $|\cup_{i=1}^{n-3} H_i| \geq m - 1$. Then, since $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$, we obtain that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m - 1$ by Claim 15. Therefore $d(x_{q+n-2}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$. Note that, by (*), $x_{q+2n-4}x \notin D$ and similarly to Claim 15, one can show that

$$A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow H_{n-2}) = \emptyset. \quad (58)$$

For each $t \in [1, n-3]$ it is easy to see that

$$A(R_t \setminus \{x_{q+2n-4}\} \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}) = \emptyset. \quad (59)$$

Indeed, if $x_i x_{q+n-1} \in D$ for some $x_i \in R_t \setminus \{x_{q+2n-4}\}$, then $x_{q+2n-4-t}x \in D$ by (54), and $C_n = xx_{i-t}x_{i-t+1} \dots x_i x_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-4-t}x$, a contradiction.

Case 2.1. $xx_{q+n-1} \notin D$. Then $\alpha_1 = 1$. From (57) and (59) we have

$$m - 1 \geq \left| \bigcup_{t=1}^{n-3} R_t \setminus \{x_{q+2n-4}\} \right| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + n - 3.$$

It follows that $\alpha_2 = n - 4$ (i.e., $x \rightarrow C(q+n, q+2n-5)$), $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$, $id(x_{q+n-1}) \leq m - 1$ and $C(q+n, q+2n-4) \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}$. This implies that $A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow H_j) = \emptyset$ for each $j \in [1, n-3]$ (otherwise if $x_i \in H_j$ and $x_{q+n-1}x_i \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n} \dots x_{q+2n-3-j}x_{q+n-1}x_i x_{i+1} \dots x_{i+j-1}x$). Hence, using

(56), we get $od(x_{q+n-1}) \leq m-1$. So $d(x_{q+n-1}) \leq 2m-2$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$. Then $\alpha_1 = 2$.

Suppose that $\alpha_2 = n-4$ (i.e., $x \rightarrow C(q+n-2, q+2n-5)$). Note that $A(\{x_{q+2n-4}, \dots, x_{q+3n-7}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$ by (*). For each $j \in [1, n-2]$ it is easy to see that $A(x_{q+2n-5} \rightarrow H_j) = \emptyset$ (otherwise if $x_i \in H_j$ and $x_{q+2n-5}x_i \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n+j-3} \dots x_{q+2n-5}x_ix_{i+1} \dots x_{i+j-1}x$). From this and (55a) it follows that $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \in D$. Then it is easy to see that $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow H_j) = \emptyset$ for each $j \in [1, n-3]$. Therefore from (55), (58) and $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$ it follows that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq p/2-2$, a contradiction.

Now suppose that $\alpha_2 \leq n-5$. If $C(q+n-1, q+2n-5) \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}$, then, since $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$, from (55a), Claim 15 and (58) it follows that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq p/2-2$, a contradiction. So we may assume that there is an $l \in [1, n-3]$ such that $x_{q+2n-4-l}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$. Hence, using Claim 11 and inequality (57) (when $j=0$), we obtain $\alpha_2 = n-5$, $od(x) = m-1$, $p = 2m$, $id(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m-1$ and

$$C(q+n-1, q+2n-5) \setminus \{x_{q+2n-4-l}\} \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}.$$

Therefore, $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow H_j) = \emptyset$ for each $j \in [1, n-3] \setminus \{l\}$ by Claim 15. Hence from (55b), (58) and $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$ it follows that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m-1$. Thus we have $d(x_{q+n-2}) \leq 2m-2$, a contradiction. Claim 16 is proved. $\square$

Notation. Let $x_l \notin C(q, q+n-3)$ be a vertex such that $x_lx \in D$ and the path $x_lx_{l+1} \dots x_q$ is as short as possible, and let

$$\beta_1 := |I(x) \cap C(q, s-1)|, \quad \beta_2 := |I(x) \cap C(s, q+n-3)| \quad \text{and} \quad b+1 := |\{x_l, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_{q-1}\}|.$$

Claim 17. $|Y| \geq m - \beta_2 + h_1$.

Proof. Using (51) it is easy to see that

$$|I(x) \cap \{x_{s+n-1}, x_{s+n}, \dots, x_l\}| = m - \beta_1 - \beta_2,$$

$$C(q+n-1, s+n-2) \cup (I(x) \cap \{x_{s+n-1}, x_{s+n}, \dots, x_l\}) \subset Y. \quad (60)$$

If $b \geq \beta_1$, then Y contains at least β_1 vertices from the set $\{x_l, x_{l+1}, x_{l+2}, \dots, x_{q-1}\} \setminus \{x_l\}$ and

$$|Y| \geq |I(x) \cap \{x_{s+n-1}, x_{s+n}, \dots, x_l\}| + h_1 + \beta_1 \geq m - \beta_2 + h_1.$$

Therefore Claim 17 holds for $b \geq \beta_1$. So we may assume that $b \leq \beta_1 - 1$. It is clear that $\beta_1 \geq b+1 \geq 1$ and

$$\{x_l, x_{l+1}, x_{l+2}, \dots, x_{q-1}\} \subset Y. \quad (61)$$

Suppose that

$$|\{x_{s+n-1}, x_{s+n}, \dots, x_l\}| \leq id(x) - \beta_2 - b - 1 = id(x) - (\beta_1 + \beta_2) + \beta_1 - b - 1.$$

Then from $\beta_1 - b \leq h_1$, (60), (61) and the definition of Y it follows that $Y = \{x_{q+n-1}, x_{q+n}, \dots, x_{q-1}\}$, $|Y| = p-n$ and $x_{p-1} \in Y$. By Claim 12, $n < p-m$ (i.e., $m < p-n$). On the other hand, $|Y| \leq m$ by Claim 10, and hence $p-n \leq m$. This contradicts that $m < p-n$.

Now suppose that

$$|\{x_{s+n-1}, x_{s+n}, \dots, x_l\}| \geq id(x) - (\beta_1 + \beta_2) + \beta_1 - b.$$

Then, since $\beta_1 - b \leq h_1$, at least $\beta_1 - b$ vertices from $Y \cap \{x_{s+n-1}, x_{s+n}, \dots, x_l\}$ are not dominated by the vertex x . Therefore, by (60) and (61),

$$|Y| \geq id(x) - (\beta_1 + \beta_2) + (\beta_1 - b) + b + h_1 \geq m - \beta_2 + h_1,$$

and Claim 17 is proved. $\square$

Claim 18. $h_1 \leq h_2 - 2$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $h_1 \geq h_2 - 1$. Note that $h_2 \geq 2$, $h_1 \geq 1$ and $s \geq q + 1$.

Let $F_0 := O(x) \cap \{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}, \dots, x_{q-1}\}$ and if $j \geq 1$, then let $F_j := \{x_i/x_{i-1} \in F_{j-1}\}$.

Using Claim 9(i) we see that for all $j \geq 0$,

$$|F_j| = od(x) - h_1 - 1. \quad (62)$$

We now show that

$$xx_{q+n-4} \in D \quad (\text{i.e., } s = q + n - 4) \quad \text{or} \quad x_{q+n-4}x \notin D. \quad (63)$$

Suppose, on the contrary, that is $xx_{q+n-4} \notin D$ and $x_{q+n-4}x \in D$. Then $h_2 \geq 3$, $h_1 \geq 2$, $n \geq 7$ and by (*), $A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}\}) = \emptyset$. Therefore $F_i \cap C(q, q + n - 3) = \emptyset$, $i \in [0, 2]$, and from (62) it follows that for each pair of distinct $i, j \in [0, 2]$ the following holds

$$|F_i \cup F_j| \geq od(x) - h_1. \quad (64)$$

From $\beta_2 \leq h_2 \leq h_1 + 1$ and Claim 17 it follows that $|Y| \geq m - 1$. Then by Claim 10, $x_{q+n-3} \rightarrow \{x_{q+i}, x_{q+j}\}$ for some distinct $i, j \in [0, 2]$. Therefore $A(F_i \cup F_j \rightarrow x_{q+n-3}) = \emptyset$ by Claim 13. Hence, using (64), $xx_{q+n-3} \notin D$ and Claim 14, we see that $id(x_{q+n-3}) \leq p/2 - 2$, a contradiction. So (63) is proved.

Let $xx_{q+n-4} \notin D$ (i.e., $s \leq q + n - 5$). From (63) we have $x_{q+n-4}x \notin D$, $A(x, x_{q+n-4}) = \emptyset$ and $\beta_2 \leq h_2 - 1$. Recall that $|Y| \leq m$ (Claim 10) and $|Y| \geq m - \beta_2 + h_1$ (Claim 17). Hence $h_1 \leq \beta_2$. Therefore $h_2 - 1 \leq h_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq h_2 - 1$, $h_1 = \beta_2 = h_2 - 1$ and $C(s, q + n - 5) \rightarrow x$. It follows from Claims 10 and 17 that $|Y| = m$ and $x_{q+n-3} \rightarrow C(q, q + n - 4)$. Therefore if $A(F_1 \rightarrow x_{q+n-3}) \neq \emptyset$, then $C_n = xx_i x_{i+1} x_{q+n-3} x_q x_{q+1} \dots x_{q+n-5} x$, a contradiction. So we may assume that $A(F_1 \rightarrow x_{q+n-3}) = \emptyset$. Since $xx_{q+n-3} \notin D$, using (62) and Claim 14, we see that $id(x_{q+n-3}) \leq p - od(x) - 2 \leq m - 1$. Hence $p = 2m$. On the other hand, from $|Y| = m$ and Claim 10 it follows that $od(x_{q+n-3}) \leq m - 1$. Therefore $d(x_{q+n-3}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction.

Let now $xx_{q+n-4} \in D$ (i.e., $s = q + n - 4$). Then $h_2 = 2$ and $\beta_2 \leq 2$.

Suppose first that $n \geq 6$. Then from $h_2 = 2 \geq \beta_2 \geq h_1 \geq 2$ (by Claims 10 and 17) it follows that $\beta_2 = 2$ (i.e., $x_{q+n-4}x \in D$) and $n = 6$. By Claims 10 and 17, $|Y| = m$ and $x_{q+n-3} \rightarrow C(q, q + n - 4)$. Since $A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}\}) = \emptyset$ and (62), we have $|\cup_{i=0}^3 F_i| \geq od(x) - h_1 + 2$. It follows from Claim 13 that $A(\cup_{i=0}^3 F_i \rightarrow x_{q+n-3}) = \emptyset$. Together with $xx_{q+n-3} \notin D$ this implies that $id(x_{q+n-3}) \leq p - 2 - od(x) \leq m - 1$. Thus $p = 2m$. On the other hand, from $|Y| = m$ and Claim 10 we have $id(x_{q+n-3}) \leq m - 1$. Therefore, $d(x_{q+n-3}) \leq 2m - 2$, which is a contradiction.

So suppose next that $n = 5$. Note that $x_{q+n-3} = x_{q+2}$.

Let $x_{q+1}x \notin D$. If $x_i \in I(x) \setminus \{x_{q+2}\}$, then $x_{q+1}x_{i-2} \notin D$ (otherwise $C_5 = xx_{q+1}x_{i-2}x_{i-1}x_ix$) and if $x_i \in I(x) \setminus \{x_q, x_{q+2}\}$, then $x_{q+1}x_{i-1} \notin D$ (otherwise $C_5 = xx_q x_{q+1}x_{i-1}x_ix$). Since $x_{q+1}x \notin D$, $id(x) = m$ and the number of such vertices x_{i-2} and x_{i-1} at least m , we obtain $od(x_{q+1}) \leq p - m - 2$, a contradiction.

Let now $x_{q+1}x \in D$. Then $\beta_2 = 2$ and $A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}\}) = \emptyset$ by (*). By (62),

$$|\bigcup_{i=0}^2 F_i| \geq od(x). \quad (65)$$

Assume that $x_{q+2} \rightarrow \{x_q, x_{q+1}\}$. From Claim 13 it follows that $A(\cup_{i=0}^2 F_i \rightarrow x_{q+2}) = \emptyset$. Together with (65) and $xx_{q+2} \notin D$ this implies that $x_q x_{q+2} \in D$. It is not difficult to see that $A(x_{q+3} \rightarrow I(x) \setminus \{x_{q+2}\}) =$

$\emptyset$. This and $x_{q+3}x \notin D$ imply that $od(x_{q+3}) \leq p - id(x) - 1$ and $x_{q+3}x_{q+2} \in D$. Since $x_{q+2} \rightarrow \{x_q, x_{q+1}\}$, it follows that $A(O(x) \cup \{x\} \rightarrow x_{q+3}) = \emptyset$. Hence $id(x_{q+3}) \leq p - 2 - od(x)$. Together with the fact that $od(x_{q+3}) \leq p - id(x) - 1$ this gives $d(x_{q+3}) \leq p - 2$, a contradiction.

Now assume that $|A(x_{q+2} \rightarrow \{x_q, x_{q+1}\})| \leq 1$. Using Claims 10 and 17, we obtain that $|Y| = m - 1$ and $x_{q+2}x_{q+j} \in D$ for some $j \in [0, 1]$. Let $x_qx \notin D$. Then $xx_{q-3} \in D$ by (*), and $|B := I(x) \cap \{x_{q+3}, x_{q+4}, \dots, x_{q-1}\}| = m - 2$. From this and $|Y| = m - 1$ it follows that $B = \{x_{q+5}, x_{q+6}, \dots, x_{q+m+2}\}$. Hence $x_{q-1}x \notin D$ and $x_{q+2}x_{q-1} \in D$ by Claim 10, $x_{q-1} \notin Y$. Now, since $xx_{q-3} \in D$, we obtain $A(x_{q-1} \rightarrow I(x) \cup \{x\}) = \emptyset$. Thus $od(x_{q-1}) \leq p - m - 2$, which is a contradiction. Let now $x_qx \in D$. Then $A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q-3}, x_{q-2}, x_{q-1}\}) = \emptyset$ by (*). It is not difficult to see that $A(F_0 \cup F_1 \cup \{x, x_{q+2}, x_{q+3}\} \rightarrow x_{q-1}) = \emptyset$. Therefore, since $|F_0 \cup F_1| \geq od(x) - 1$, it follows that $xx_{q+3} \in D$, $|F_0 \cup F_1| = od(x) - 1$, $F_0 = \{x_{q+3}, x_{q+4}, \dots, x_{q+od(x)}\}$ and $\{x_q, x_{q+1}\} \rightarrow x_{q-1}$. Hence, if $x_i \notin \{x_q, x_{q+1}\}$ and $xx_i \in D$, then $A(\{x_{i+j}, x_{i+2}\} \rightarrow x_{q+2}) = \emptyset$. Since $A(\{x, x_{q-1}\} \rightarrow x_{q+2}) = \emptyset$, we conclude that $id(x_{q+2}) \leq p - od(x) - 2$. On the other hand, we have $A(x_{q+2} \rightarrow Y \cup \{x_{q+1-j}\}) = \emptyset$. Because of this and $|Y| = m - 1$ we get $od(x_{q+2}) \leq p - m - 1$. Therefore $d(x_{q+2}) \leq p - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 18 is proved. $\square$

Note that Claims 16 and 18 imply that $n \geq 6$.

Claim 19. (i) $L_0 := A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow C(q+n, q+2n-5)) = \emptyset$ and

(ii) $|A(x_{q+2n-5} \rightarrow x_{q+n-2})| + |A(x \rightarrow x_{q+n-1})| \leq 1$.

Proof. Note that $s \geq q + 1$ by Claim 16.

(i) Suppose that $L_0 \neq \emptyset$, and let $x_{q+n-2}x_i \in L_0$. By (50) and Claim 9(ii), we have if $x_i \in C(q+n, s+n-2)$, then $C_n = xx_{s-f(q+n-1, i-1)+1} \dots x_{q+n-2}x_i \dots x_{s+n-1}x$ and if $x_i \in C(s+n-1, q+2n-5)$, then $C_n = xx_{q+1} \dots x_{q+n-2}x_ix$, a contradiction.

(ii) Suppose that $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2}$ and $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$. Then for $j = 1$ Claim 15 holds (i.e., $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow H_1) = \emptyset$). From this, Claim 19(i) and (51) it follows that $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow C(q+n, q+2n-5) \cup I(x)) = \emptyset$. Therefore, since $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$ and $|I(x)| = m$, we see that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq p/2 - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 19 is proved. $\square$

Claim 20. If $x_{q+2n-4}x \notin D$ and $i \in [0, 1]$, then $|A(x_{q+2n-6+i} \rightarrow x_{q+n-2})| + |A(x \rightarrow x_{q+n-1+i})| \leq 1$.

Proof. Assume that the claim is false, that $x_{q+2n-4}x \notin D$, $i \in [0, 1]$ and $x_{q+2n-6+i}x_{q+n-2}$, $xx_{q+n-1+i} \in D$. It is easy to see that if $x_j \notin A(q+n-2, q+2n-4)$ and $x_jx \in D$, then $x_{q+n-2}x_{j-1} \notin D$ (otherwise $C_n = xx_{q+n-1+i} \dots x_{q+2n-6+i}x_{q+n-2}x_{j-1}x_jx$). Together with $A(\{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$ (by $s \geq q + 1$ and (*)) and Claim 19(i) this implies that the vertex x_{q+n-2} does not dominate at least $id(x) + 1 = m + 1$ vertices. Thus $od(x) \leq p/2 - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 20 is proved. $\square$

Claim 21. $|Z| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 + h_2 - 2$.

Proof. Let $B := \{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}, \dots, x_{s-1}, x_s\}$. Note that $|B| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + 1$ and $C(s+1, q+n-4) \subseteq Z$ by $xx_{q-1} \notin D$ and by Claim 9(i). Hence for $\alpha_2 = 0$ Claim 21 is true. Assume that $\alpha_2 \geq 1$. If $|B| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1$, then at least α_2 vertices of B are not in $O(x)$, and the set Z contains at least $od(x) - \alpha_1$ vertices from B since $\alpha_2 \leq h_1 - 2$. From this and $C(s+1, q+n-4) \subset Z$, we obtain $|Z| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 + h_2 - 2$, and the claim is holds for this case. Assume that $|B| \leq od(x) - \alpha_1 - 1$. It is not difficult to see that $Z = C \setminus \{x_{q+n-3}, x_{q+n-2}, \dots, x_{q+2n-5}\}$. Therefore, by Claim 11, $m \geq |Z| = p - n$ and $x_{p-1} \in Z$. Hence, by Claim 12, $n < p - m$ (i.e., $m < p - n$), a contradiction. Claim 21 is proved. $\square$

Claim 22. If $L_1 := A(\{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$, then $x_{q+2n-7}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$.

Proof. Assume that $L_1 = \emptyset$ and $x_{q+2n-7}x_{q+n-2} \in D$. Note that $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$ by (*). Hence $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow H_3) = \emptyset$ by Claim 15, and $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow C(q+n, q+2n-5)) = \emptyset$ by Claim 19(i).

Then, since $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$, (51) and $|H_3| \geq id(x) - n + 4$, we obtain that x_{q+n-2} does not dominate at least $m + 1$ vertices, a contradiction. Claim 22 is proved. $\square$

Claim 23. $|A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}\})| \leq 1$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that is $x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}\}$. Then $L_1 := A(\{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset$ by (*). Therefore from Claims 19(ii), 20 (when $\gamma = 0$) and 22 it follows that

$$L_2 := A(\{x_{q+2n-7}, x_{q+2n-6}, x_{q+2n-5}\} \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}) = \emptyset.$$

Hence $|Z| \leq m - 3$ by Claim 11, and $od(x) - \alpha_1 + h_2 - 2 \leq |Z| \leq m - 3$ by Claim 21. It follows from Claim 18 that $od(x) = m - 1$, $h_2 \leq \alpha_1 \leq h_1 + 2 \leq h_2$. Clearly, $\alpha_1 = h_2 = h_1 + 2 \geq 3$ and $|Z| = m - 3$. The equality $\alpha_1 = h_1 + 2$ means that $x \rightarrow C(q + n - 2, s + n - 1)$ and hence by (*) we have

$$L_3 = A(\{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}, x_{q+2n-2}\} \rightarrow x) = \emptyset.$$

Let E_3 denote the set of vertices $x_j \notin C(q + n - 3, q + 2n - 5)$ for which $x_{j+3}x \in D$. Then $|E_3| \geq m - h_2 + 1$ by $L_3 = \emptyset$. Together with $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$, $L_3 = \emptyset$ and Claim 19(i) this implies that $x_{q+n-2}x_j \in D$ for some $x_j \in E_3$. If $n = 6$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n-2}x_jx_{j+1}x_{j+2}x_{j+3}x$, a contradiction. Assume that $n \geq 7$. From $|Z| = m - 3$, $L_2 = \emptyset$ and Claim 11 it follows that $x_{q+2n-8}x_{q+n-2} \in D$ and $C_n = xx_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-8}x_{q+n-2}x_jx_{j+1}x_{j+2}x_{j+3}x$, a contradiction. Claim 23 is proved. $\square$

Claim 24. (i) $xx_{q+n-1} \notin D$, $x_{q+2n-3}x \in D$ and (ii) $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$, $x_{q+2n-4}x \notin D$.

Proof. (i) Suppose that $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$. Then $xx_{q+n-2} \notin D$ by Claim 23 and $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$ by Claim 19(ii). Together with Claims 11, 18, 21 and $\alpha_1 \leq h_1 + 1 \leq h_2 - 1$ this implies that $|Z| = m - 2$, $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$, $h_1 = h_2 - 2$, $\alpha_1 = h_1 + 1$, $id(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m - 1$ and $x_{q+2n-6}x_{q+n-2} \in D$. Since $xx_{q+n-2} \notin D$ and $xx_{q+n-1} \in D$, by (*) we have $x_{q+2n-4}x \in D$ and $x_{q+2n-3}x \notin D$.

Let E_1 denote the set of vertices $x_j \notin C(q + n - 3, q + 2n - 4)$ for which $x_{j+1}x \in D$. Since

$$|I(x) \cap C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 4)| = h_2, \quad (66)$$

it is easy to see that $|E_1| \geq m - h_2$. If $x_{q+n-2}x_i \in D$, where $x_i \in E_1$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-6}x_{q+n-2}x_ix_{i+1}x$, a contradiction. So we can assume that $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow E_1) = \emptyset$. From this, Claim 19(i) and $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$ it follows that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m - 1$. Therefore $d(x_{q+n-2}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction. This proves that $xx_{q+n-1} \notin D$, and hence $x_{q+2n-3}x \in D$ by (*).

(ii) Suppose that $xx_{q+n-2} \notin D$. Then $|Z| \leq m - 1$ by Claim 11. On the other hand, $xx_{q+n-1} \notin D$ by Claims 24(i), and $\alpha_1 \leq h_1 \leq h_2 - 2$ by Claim 18. Therefore by Claim 21, $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$, $\alpha_1 = h_1$ and $|Z| = m - 1$. It follows from Claim 11 that $id(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m - 1$ and $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \in D$. Then, since $\alpha_1 = h_1$ and $A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n-2}, x_{q+n-1}\}) = \emptyset$, we have $xx_{q+n} \in D$.

Let E'_1 denote the set of vertices $x_j \notin C(q + n - 3, q + 2n - 5)$ for which $x_{j+1}x \in D$. It is easy to see that $|E'_1| = m - h_2$ by (66), and $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow E'_1) = \emptyset$ (otherwise if $x_{q+n-2}x_j \in D$, where $x_j \in E'_1$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n} \dots x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2}x_jx_{j+1}x$). This together with Claim 19(i) and $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$ implies that $od(x_{q+n-2}) \leq m - 1$. Therefore $d(x_{q+n-2}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction. This shows that $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$, and hence $x_{q+2n-4}x \notin D$ by (*). Claim 24 is proved. $\square$

Claim 25. $L_4 := A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow \{x_q, x_{q+1}\}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $L_4 \neq \emptyset$. It is easy to see that if $x_{q+n-1}x_q \in D$, then $C_n = x_{q+n-1}x_qx_{q+1} \dots x_{q+n-1}$ and if $x_{q+n-1}x_{q+1} \in D$, then $C_n = x_{q+n-1}x_{q+1} \dots x_{q+n-3}xx_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}$ since $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$ by Claim 24(ii), a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 26. If $s \geq q + 2$, then $L_5 := A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow C(s + n - 1, q + 2n - 5)) = \emptyset$.

Proof. If $x_{q+n-1}x_i \in L_5$, then by Claim 9(ii), $C_n = xx_{q+2}x_{q+3} \dots x_{q+n-1}x_ix$, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 27. $xx_{q+n} \notin D$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $xx_{q+n} \in D$. Note that $x_{q+2n-4}x \notin D$ (Claim 24(ii)), $s \geq q + 1$ (Claim 16) and $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$ (Claim 20, when $\gamma = 1$). Therefore from Claim 11 it follows that $|Z| \leq m - 1$. Using Claim 9(ii) and (51), we obtain

$$|I(x) \cap C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 5)| = h_2 - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |H_2| \geq m - h_2 + 1. \quad (67)$$

Now we distinguish two cases.

Case 1. $x_{q+2n-6}x_{q+n-2} \in D$. It is easy to see that $L_6 := A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow H_2) = \emptyset$ (otherwise $x_{q+n-1}x_i \in L_6$ and $C_n = xx_{q+n} \dots x_{q+2n-6}x_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_ix_{i+1}x$). If $s \geq q + 2$, then from $x_{q+n-1}x \notin D$, (67), $L_6 = \emptyset$ and Claim 26 it follows that $od(x_{q+n-1}) \leq p/2 - 2$, a contradiction. So we may assume that $s = q + 1$. Then $\alpha_1 = 2$ and from $h_1 \leq h_2 - 2$ (Claim 18) and $m - 1 \geq |Z| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 + h_2 - 2$ (Claim 11 and 21) it follows that $3 \leq h_2 \leq 4$ and $6 \leq n \leq 7$. If $x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n+1} \in D$, then by Claim 24(i), $C_n = xx_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n+1} \dots x_{q+2n-3}x$, a contradiction. Hence $x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n+1} \notin D$. If $h_2 = 4$, then $|Z| = m - 1$, and using Claim 11, we obtain $x_{q+n}x_{q+n-2} \in D$ since $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$. Therefore when $h_2 = 4$, then $x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n+2} \notin D$ (otherwise by Claim 24(i), $C_n = xx_{q+n}x_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n+2} \dots x_{q+2n-3}x$). Thus, since $n = 6$ or 7 , we have

$$L_7 := A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow C(q + n + 1, q + 2n - 5)) = \emptyset.$$

From $L_6 = \emptyset$, (67) and $x_{q+n-1}x \notin D$ it follows that for all $x_i \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 5)$,

$$x_{q+n-1}x_i \in D \quad \text{if and only if} \quad x_{i+1}x \notin D. \quad (68)$$

Together with Claim 25 this implies that $\{x_{q+1}x_{q+2}\} \rightarrow x$, in particular, $x_{q+n-5}x \in D$ since $6 \leq n \leq 7$. If $x_{q+n-1}x_{q-1} \in D$, then $C_n = x_{q+n-1}x_{q-1}x_q \dots x_{q+n-5}xx_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}$. So we may assume that $x_{q+n-1}x_{q-1} \notin D$. Hence $x_qx \in D$ by (68). Continuing in this manner, we obtain $\{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}, \dots, x_{q+2}\} \rightarrow x$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $x_{q+2n-6}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$. Then from $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$ and Claim 11 it follows that $|Z| \leq m - 2$. This together with Claims 21, 23 and 18 implies that $h_2 = h_1 + 2$, $\alpha_1 = h_1 + 1$, $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$,

$$C(q + n - 1, q + 2n - 7) \rightarrow x_{q+n-2} \quad (69)$$

and if $x_i \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 5)$, then $x_ix_{q+n-2} \in D$ if and only if $x_i \notin Z$.

We now show that $s = q + 1$. Suppose that $s \geq q + 2$. Then $n \geq 8$, since $h_2 = h_1 + 2 \geq 4$. If $x_ix \in D$, $x_i \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 3)$ and $x_{q+n-1}x_{i-2} \in D$ or $x_{q+n-1}x_{i-3} \in D$ then by (69), $C_n = xx_{q+n} \dots x_{q+2n-7}x_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{i-2}x_{i-1}x_ix$ or $C_n = xx_{q+n} \dots x_{q+2n-8}x_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{i-3}x_{i-2}x_{i-1}x_ix$, a contradiction. So we may assume that if $x_ix \in D$ and $x_i \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 3)$, then $L_8 := A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow \{x_{i-3}, x_{i-2}\}) = \emptyset$. Since

$$|I(x) \cap \{x_{q+2n-3}, x_{q+2n-2}, x_{q+2n-1}, \dots, x_{q+n-3}\}| = id(x) - h_2 + 1, \quad (70)$$

we see that the number of such x_{i-2} and x_{i-3} vertices at least $id(x) - h_2 + 1$. Therefore from $L_8 = \emptyset$, $x_{q+n-1}x \notin D$ and Claim 26 it follows that $od(x_{q+n-1}) \leq m - 2$, a contradiction. The equality $s = q + 1$ is proved.

Then $h_1 = 1$ since $s = q + 1$. From $h_2 = h_1 + 2$ it follows that $h_2 = 3$ and $n = 6$. Note that $x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n-2} \in D$ by (69), and $A(x_{q+n-2} \rightarrow \{x_{q+n}, x_{q+n+1}\}) = \emptyset$ ($x_{q+n+1} = x_{q+2n-5}$) by Claim 19(i). From this, $x_{q+n-2}x \notin D$ and (70) it follows that there is a vertex $x_l \notin C(q+n-2, q+2n-5)$ such that $x_lx, x_{q+n-2}x_{l-1} \in D$ (respectively, $x_j \notin C(q+n-2, q+2n-5)$ such that $x_jx, x_{q+n-2}x_j \in D$). It is easy to see that

$$A(\{x_{q+n}, x_{q+n+1}\} \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}) = \emptyset, \quad (71)$$

(otherwise if $x_{q+n+1}x_{q+n-1} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n}x_{q+n+1}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n-2}x_jx$ and if $x_{q+n}x_{q+n-1} \in D$, then $C_n = xx_{q+n}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n-2}x_{l-1}x_lx$). On the other hand, if $xx_i \in D$ and $x_{i+t} \notin C(q+n-2, q+2n-4)$, where $t \in [1, 2]$, then $x_{i+t}x_{q+n-1} \notin D$, since in the converse case, $C_n = xx_i \dots x_{i+t}x_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-4-t}x$, a contradiction. Since

$$|O(x) \cap \{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}, \dots, x_{q+1}\}| \geq od(x) - 3$$

and $xx_{q-1} \notin D$ it follows that the number of such x_{i+t} , $t \in [1, 2]$, vertices at least $od(x) - 1$. Therefore, by (71) and $xx_{q+n-1} \notin D$ we obtain $id(x_{q+n-1}) \leq m - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 27 is proved. $\square$

Claim 28. $\alpha_1 = h_1$.

Proof. By Claims 24(i) and 27, $L_9 := A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n-1}, x_{q+n}\}) = \emptyset$. Suppose that Claim 28 is false (i.e., $\alpha_1 \neq h_1$). Note that $s \geq q + 1$ (in particular, $h_1 \geq 1$) by Claim 16, and $\alpha_1 \leq h_1 - 1$ by $L_9 = \emptyset$. From Claims 11, 21 and 18 it follows that $\alpha_1 = h_1 - 1$, $h_2 = h_1 + 2$, $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$ and $|Z| = m$. Using $|Z| = m$ and Claim 11, we obtain $x_ix_{q+n-2} \in D$ if and only if $x_i \notin Z$, in particular,

$$C(q+n-1, q+2n-5) \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}. \quad (72)$$

By Claim 24(ii), $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$. Hence $1 \leq \alpha_1 = h_1 - 1$ and $h_1 \geq 2$ (i.e., $s \geq q + 2$).

Suppose first that $h_1 \geq 3$. In this case it is easy to see that

$$L_{10} := A(x_{q+n} \rightarrow C(s+n-1, q+2n-5)) = \emptyset,$$

(otherwise if $x_{q+n}x_i \in L_{10}$, then by Claim 9(ii), $C_n = xx_{q+3}x_{q+4} \dots x_{q+n}x_ix$). Using the fact that $L_9 = \emptyset$ and $\alpha_1 = h_1 - 1 \geq 2$ we obtain that $xx_{q+n+j} \in D$ for some $j \in [1, 2]$. It is not difficult to see that if $x_i \notin C(q+n-2, q+2n-5)$ and $x_ix \in D$, then $x_{q+n}x_{i+1-j} \notin D$ (otherwise by (72) and $xx_{q+n+j} \in D$ we have $C_n = xx_{q+n+j} \dots x_{q+n-5}x_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n}x_{i+1-j}x_ix$). Together with

$$|I(x) \cap \{x_{q+2n-3}, x_{q+2n-2}, \dots, x_{q+n-3}\}| \geq m - h_2 + 1,$$

$x_{q+n}x \notin D$ and $L_{10} = \emptyset$ this implies that x_{q+n} does not dominate at least $m + 1$ vertices, which is a contradiction.

So suppose next that $h_1 = 2$. Then from $\alpha_1 = h_1 - 1 = h_2 - 3 = 1$ it follows that $n = 8$. From $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$, $L_9 = \emptyset$ and $\alpha_1 = 1$ we have $A(x \rightarrow C(q+n-1, q+n+1)) = \emptyset$.

For each $l \in [1, 3]$ by R'_l we denote the set of vertices $x_{i+l} \notin C(q+n-2, q+2n-4)$ for which $xx_i \in D$. Using Claim 9(i) and the definition of α_1 and α_2 , we obtain

$$|\bigcup_{l=1}^3 R'_l| \geq od(x) - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + 2. \quad (73)$$

It is easy to see that for all $l \in [1, 3]$,

$$L_{11} := A(R'_l \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}) = \emptyset,$$

(otherwise if $x_{i+l}x_{q+n-1} \in L_{11}$, then by Claim 9(ii), $C_n = xx_i \dots x_{i+l}x_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-4-l}x$). It follows from $L_{11} = \emptyset$, $\alpha_1 = 1$, (73) and $xx_{q+n-1} \notin D$ that $|\bigcup_{l=1}^3 R'_l| \leq m - 1$ and $\alpha_2 \geq 1$. From this, (73) and

$xx_{q-1} \notin D$ it is not difficult to see that $\alpha_2 = 2$ (i.e., $x \rightarrow \{x_{q+2n-6}, x_{q+2n-5}\}$), $x_q = x_1$ and $x_{q+2n-5} = x_{p-2}$ (otherwise we obtain that $|\cup_{l=1}^3 R'_l| \geq od(x) + 1$, which is a contradiction). Therefore $p = 2n - 2$ ($p = 14$, $n = m + 1$) and $\cup_{l=1}^3 R'_l = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-2}\}$. Then, since $L_{11} = \emptyset$ and $|\cup_{l=1}^3 R'_l| = m - 1 = 6$, $id(x_{q+n-1}) = n - 1$ and $C(q + n, p - 1) \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}$. On the other hand, since $C_n \not\subset D$, it is easy to see that

$$A(x_{q+n-1} \rightarrow \{x_{q+n+1}, \dots, x_{p-2}, x_1, x_2, x_3, x\}) = \emptyset \quad (q + n + 1 = p - 4).$$

This means that $od(x_{q+n-1}) \leq m - 1$, and hence $d(x_{q+n-1}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 28 is proved. $\square$

Claim 29. $s = q + 1$.

Proof. Suppose, on the contrary, that $s \neq q + 1$. Then by Claims 16, 24, 27 and 28 we have $s \geq q + 2$, $\alpha_1 = h_1$ and

$$x \rightarrow C(q + n + 1, s + n - 1) \cup \{x_{q+n-2}\}. \quad (74)$$

If $x_{s+n-3}x_i \in D$, where $x_i \in C(s + n - 1, q + 2n - 5)$, then by Claim 9(ii), $C_n = xx_sx_{s+1} \dots x_{s+n-3}x_ix$. So we may assume that

$$A(x_{s+n-3} \rightarrow C(s + n - 1, q + 2n - 5)) = \emptyset.$$

Then, since $|H_2| = m - h_2 + 1$, $|C(s + n - 1, q + 2n - 5)| = h_2 - 1$ and (by (51)) $x_{s+n-3}x \notin D$ it is easy to see that

$$L_{12} := A(x_{s+n-3} \rightarrow H_2) \neq \emptyset.$$

If $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \in D$, then by (74), $C_n = xx_{s+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \dots x_{s+n-3}x_ix_{i+1}x$, where $x_{s+n-3}x_i \in L_{12}$. So we may assume that $x_{q+2n-5}x_{q+n-2} \notin D$. Since $\alpha_1 = h_1 \leq h_2 - 2$ and $x_{q+2n-5} \notin Z$, from Claims 21 and 11 it follows that $|Z| = m - 1$, $od(x) = m - 1$, $p = 2m$, $h_2 = h_1 + 2$ and

$$C(q + n - 1, q + 2n - 6) \rightarrow x_{q+n-2}, \quad (75)$$

If $s \geq q + 3$, then $s + n - 2 \geq q + n + 1$ and $C_n = xx_{s+n-2} \dots x_{q+2n-6}x_{q+n-2} \dots x_{s+n-3}x_ix_{i+1}x$, where $x_{s+n-3}x_i \in L_{12}$ by (74) and (75), a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $s = q + 2$. Therefore $h_1 = 2$, $h_2 = 4$ and $n = 8$. From $A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n-1}, x_{q+n}\}) = \emptyset$ (by Claims 27 and 24(i)) and (*) it follows that $\{x_{q+2n-3}, x_{q+2n-2}\} \rightarrow x$. Together with $n = 8$ this implies that for each $i \in [0, 1]$,

$$x_{q+n}x_{q+2n-5-i} \notin D, \quad (76)$$

(otherwise, since $xx_{q+n-2} \in D$, we have $C_n = xx_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n}x_{q+2n-5-i} \dots x_{q+2n-2-i}x$). Moreover, it is easy to see that $L_{13} := A(x_{q+n} \rightarrow H_l) = \emptyset$, where $l \in [2, 3]$ (otherwise if $x_{q+n}x_i \in L_{13}$, then by (74) and (75), $C_n = xx_{q+n+1} \dots x_{q+2n-4-l}x_{q+n-2}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n}x_i \dots x_{i+l-1}x$). Since $xx_{q+n+1} \in D$, by (*) we have $x_{q+2n-1}x \notin D$ and it is not difficult to see that $|H_2 \cup H_3| \geq m - 2$. From this, (76) and $x_{q+n}x \notin D$ it follows that $od(x_{q+n}) \leq m - 2$, a contradiction. Claim 29 is proved. $\square$

Now we will complete the proof of Theorem 2 in Subcase 2.2.2. Note that Claims 29, 18, 24, 27, 11 and 21 imply that $s = q + 1$, $h_2 - 2 \geq h_1 = \alpha_1 = 1$ and $3 \leq h_2 \leq 4$ ($6 \leq n \leq 7$).

Let $B := \{x_{q+2n-4}, x_{q+2n-3}, \dots, x_{q-1}\}$ and $b := od(x, B)$. It follows from $\alpha_1 = 1$ and Claim 9(i) that

$$b = od(x) - \alpha_2 - 3. \quad (77)$$

Let E denote the set of vertices $x_{i+l} \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 4)$, where $l \in [1, n - 4]$, for which $xx_i \in D$.

It is easy to see that $L_{14} := A(E \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}) = \emptyset$ (otherwise $x_{i+l}x_{q+n-1} \in L_{14}$ and $C_n = xx_ix_{i+1} \dots x_{i+l}x_{q+n-1} \dots x_{q+2n-4-l}x$ by Claim 9(ii)). From this and $L_9 = A(x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n-1}, x_{q+n}\}) = \emptyset$ (by Claims

24(i) and 27), we obtain $|E| \leq m - 1$. Remark that from $x \rightarrow \{x_q, x_{q+1}\}$ and $xx_{q-1} \notin D$ it follows that $\{x_{q+1}, x_{q+2}, \dots, x_{q+n-3}\} \subset E$. Hence if $b \geq 1$, then the set E contains at least $b + 1$ vertices from $B \cup \{x_q\}$.

We now show that $\alpha_2 = n - 5$, i.e.

$$x \rightarrow \{x_{q+n+1}, \dots, x_{q+2n-5}\}. \quad (78)$$

Assume that $\alpha_2 \neq n - 5$. Then from $L_9 = \emptyset$ we have $\alpha_2 \leq n - 6$. Therefore $b \geq od(x) - n + 3 \geq 1$ by (77), and $n \leq m + 1$. It follows immediately from the remark above that the set E contains at least $b + n - 2 \geq m$ vertices. This contrary to $|E| \leq m - 1$ and so $\alpha_2 = n - 5$ is proved.

From $\alpha_2 = n - 5$ and (77) we get that $b = od(x) - n + 2$. It is clear that $x_{q+2n-3}x_{q+n-1} \notin D$, since otherwise, by (78) and Claim 9(ii), $C_n = x_{q+2n-3}x_{q+n-1}x_{q+n}xx_{q+n+1} \dots x_{q+2n-3}$. From $x_{q+2n-3} \notin C(q+1, q+n-3)$ it is easy to see that (in case $b = 0$ and in case $b \geq 1$) the set E contains at least $b + 1$ vertices from the set $B \cup \{x_q\}$. Thus we have $m - 1 \geq |E| \geq b + n - 2 = od(x)$. Hence $od(x) = |E| = m - 1$, $p = 2m$, $id(x_{q+n-1}) = m - 1$ by $L_{14} = \emptyset$, and $\{x_{q+n}, x_{q+n+1}, \dots, x_{q+2n-4}\} \rightarrow x_{q+n-1}$. Therefore for all $l \in [1, n - 4]$ if $x_i x \in D$ and $x_{i-l} \notin C(q + n - 2, q + 2n - 6)$, then $x_{q+n-1}x_{i-l} \notin D$, since otherwise, by (78), $C_n = xx_{q+n+1} \dots x_{q+2n-3-l}x_{q+n-1}x_{i-l} \dots x_i x$, a contradiction. It is not difficult to see that the number of such x_{i-l} vertices at least $m - 1$. Therefore, since $x_{q+n-1}x \notin D$, we get $od(x_{q+n-1}) \leq m - 1$ and $d(x_{q+n-1}) \leq 2m - 2$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

References

- [1] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, Digraphs: Theory, Algorithms and Applications, Springer, 2000.
- [2] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, H. Li, Sufficient conditions for a digraph to be hamiltonian, J. Graph Theory 22 (2) (1996) 181-187.
- [3] J. Bang-Jensen, Y. Guo, A. Yeo, A new sufficient condition for a digraph to be Hamiltonian, Discrete Applied Math. 95 (1999) 61-72.
- [4] J. Bang-Jensen, Y. Guo, A note on vertex pancyclic oriented graphs, J. Graph Theory 31 (1999) 313-318.
- [5] A. Benhocine, Pancyclism and Meyniel's conditions, Discrete Math. 58 (1986) 113-120.
- [6] J. A. Bondy, C. Thomassen, A short proof of Meyniel's theorem, Discrete Math. 19 (1977) 195-197.
- [7] D. Christofides, P. Keevash, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, A semi-exact degree condition for Hamilton cycles in digraphs, submitted for publication.
- [8] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Pancyclic and panconnected digraphs, Ph. D. Thesis, Institute Mathematici Akad. Navuk BSSR, Minsk, 1981 (in Russian).
- [9] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Cycles of any length in digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 75 (4) (1982) 147-152 (in Russian).
- [10] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Pancyclicity of digraphs with the Meyniel condition, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar., 20 (1-4) (1985) 95-117 (in Russian).
- [11] S. Kh. Darbinyan, Pancyclicity of digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 80 (2) (1985) 51-54 (see also in Math. Problems in Computer Science 14 (1985) 55-74) (in Russian).
- [12] S. Kh. Darbinyan, A sufficient condition for the Hamiltonian property of digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 82 (1) (1986) 6-8 (in Russian).
- [13] S. Kh. Darbinyan, On the pancyclicity of digraphs with large semidegrees, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 83 (3) (1986) 99-101 (in Russian).
- [14] S. Kh. Darbinyan, A sufficient condition for digraphs to be Hamiltonian, Akad. Nauk Armyan. SSR Dokl. 91 (2) (1990) 57-59 (in Russian).

- [15] S. Kh. Darbinyan, I. A. Karapetyan, On vertex pancyclicity oriented graphs, CSIT Conference, Yerevan, Armenia (2005) 154-155 (see also in Math. Problems in Computer Science, 29 (2007) 66-84) (in Russian).
- [16] S. Kh. Darbinyan, I. A. Karapetyan, On the large cycles through any given vertex in oriented graphs, CSIT Conference, Yerevan, Armenia (2007) 77-78 (see also in Math. Problems in Computer Science, 31 (2008) 90-107 (in Russian)).
- [17] S. Kh. Darbinyan, K. M. Mosesyan, On pancyclic regular oriented graphs, Akad. Nauk Armyan SSR Dokl. 67 (4) (1978) 208-211 (in Russian).
- [18] A. Ghouila-Houri, Une condition suffisante d'existence d'un circuit hamiltonien, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A-B 251 (1960) 495-497.
- [19] G. Gutin, Characterizations of vertex pancyclic and pancyclic ordinary complete multipartite digraphs, Discrete Math., 141 (1-3) (1995) 153-162.
- [20] R. Häggkvist, R. J. Faudree, R. H. Schelp, Pancyclic graphs-connected Ramsey number, Ars Combinatoria 11 (1981) 37-49.
- [21] R. Häggkvist, C. Thomassen, On pancyclic digraphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 20 (1976) 20-40.
- [22] B. Jackson, Long paths and cycles in oriented graphs, J. Graph Theory 5 (2) (1981) 145-157.
- [23] P. Keevash, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, An exact minimum degree condition for Hamilton cycles in oriented graphs, J. London Math. Soc. 79 (2009) 144-166.
- [24] L. Kelly, D. Kühn, D. Osthus, Cycles of given length in oriented graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 100 (2010) 251-264.
- [25] D. Kühn, D. Osthus, A. Treglown, Hamiltonian degree sequences in digraphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 100 (2010) 367-380.
- [26] M. Meyniel, Une condition suffisante d'existence d'un circuit hamiltonien dans un graphe orienté, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 14 (1973) 137-147.
- [27] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams, Hamilton circuits in graphs and digraphs, in: The Many Facets of Graph Theory, Springer- Verlag Lecture Notes, vol. 110, Springer Verlag (1969) 237-243.
- [28] M. Overbeck-Larisch, A theorem on pancyclic-oriented graphs, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 23 (2-3) (1977) 168-173.
- [29] Z. M. Song, Pancyclic oriented graphs, J. Graph Theory 18 (5) (1994) 461-468.
- [30] C. Thomassen, An Ore-type condition implying a digraph to be pancyclic, Discrete Math. 19 (1) (1977) 85-92.
- [31] C. Thomassen, Long cycles in digraphs, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 42 (1981) 231-251.
- [32] D. R. Woodall, Sufficient conditions for circuits in graphs, Proc. London Math. Soc. 24 (1972) 739-755.
- [33] C. Q. Zhang, Arc-disjoint circuits in digraphs, Discrete Math. 41 (1982) 79-96.